UN-OHRLLS

UN Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and the Small Island Developing States

United Nations Development Programme

# Governance for the Future

## Democracy and Development in the Least Developed Countries

UN-OHRLLS
UN Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and the Small Island Developing States

United Nations Development Programme
UNDP

# Governance for the Future

## Democracy and Development in the Least Developed Countries

**Lead Editors**
Gita Welch and Zahra Nuru

**Research, Writing and Statistics Team**
Aleida Ferreyra, Selim Jahan, Patrick Keuleers, Ramzi Mabsout, Jocelyn Mason, Tanni Mukhopadhyay, Lily Ohiorhenuan, Nadia Selim, Pauline Tamesis, and Nancy Taylor

**Production Advisor**
Magdy Martinez- Soliman

**Production Coordinators**
Lily Ohiorhenuan and Pauline Tamesis

**Editor**
Jeff Hoover

**Cover and Layout Design**
Ferro+Ferro Graphic Communication

# Preface

**THE SECRETARY-GENERAL**

**Governance for the Future:**
**Democracy and Development in the Least Developed Countries**

Good governance and development are important goals in their right; they also depend on and reinforce each other. That is one of the main lessons the United Nations has drawn from its vast and varied experience throughout the world. Without the rule of law and respect for human rights; without transparency and accountability; and unless governments derive their power legitimately, through the ballot box, the path to prosperity is likely to be more difficult, and gains could remain fragile and reversible. World leaders themselves, at the 2005 UN World Summit, agreed that good governance and the rule of law at the national and international levels are essential for sustained economic growth, sustainable development and the eradication of poverty and hunger.

*Governance for the Future: Democracy and Development in the Least Developed Countries* documents the important strides being made by the world's poorest nations to achieve better governance, and shows that poverty is not an insurmountable barrier to democracy. The report also rightly stresses the need for stronger partnerships between LDCs and the international community, so that LDCs can sustain this momentum and build up their human and institutional capacities.

*Governance for the Future* is a timely and valuable addition to the ongoing search for solutions to the development challenges facing the world's 50 most vulnerable nations. I recommend it to a wide global audience.

Kofi A. Annan
19 May 2006

# Foreword

**By UNDP Administrator And The Under-Secretary General and The High Representative Of The UN-OHRLLS**

*Governance for the Future: Democracy and Development in the LDCs* is the first United Nations Report to focus specifically on the challenges of governance faced by the 50 poorest nations in the world, collectively known as Least Developed Countries (LDCs). Jointly prepared by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the UN Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and the Small Island Developing States (UN-OHRLLS), this publication emphasizes that to achieve sustainable development, LDCs must build transparent, accountable and effective democratic governance systems. Building a strong relationship between the state and its citizens is key to successful development and to achieving the Millennium Development Goals by 2015.

*Governance for the Future* draws from the 2002 Human Development Report, which underlines that political mechanisms of participation and interaction are as important to sustainable development as economic mechanisms and the functioning of markets. Markets must be embedded in legitimate political institutions. It analyzes the democratic governance challenges facing LDCs, and examines the approaches that have been taken to date. The Report is divided into five chapters focusing on: democratic governance, the linkages between governance and poverty, the role of state and non-state actors, the rule of law, and global governance.

In the past two decades, the LDCs have seen substantial improvements in human development, despite the severity of their capacity constraints and their limited role in global trading and financial systems. However, the development and governance challenges remain immense. A step forward was made in May 2001 with the adoption of the Brussels Programme of Action for the Decade 2001-2010 at the Third UN Conference on LDCs. This publication considers the principles of the Programme to be the basis of progress for LDCs.

Commitment 2 of the Brussels Programme, out of its seven commitments, introduced good governance principles into the relationship between LDCs and their development partners for the first time. *Governance for the Future* identifies and analyzes the key issues related to the realization of Commitment 2.

The Report acknowledges that no single model of democratic governance may be suitable for all LDCs. However, it puts forward three central messages. The first message is that effective governance is essential if countries are to sustain progress over the long term, and that it takes the combination of good governance and equitably distributed economic growth to engender human development.

Secondly, the Report conveys the message that issues of governance are part of the life of all societies. Development is intrinsically linked to individual and institutional capacities and their mutual interaction. How a society is organized for productive and social change defines the governance system and how it functions.

The third key message of *Governance for the Future* is that the state bears primary responsibility for improving its governance system, along with its development responsibilities.

Good governance begins with political will and decision-making at the *national* level, which confers enormous power on state actors to enhance their own governance systems.

This publication also tackles the question of corruption, widely considered to be a primary impediment to development. Strong political leadership is instrumental to fighting corruption.

There is an overarching need for capacity support efforts by development partners, and other non-state actors to bring about lasting change, taking into account the importance of local leadership, local knowledge, and local institutions. It is our hope that this Report will first and foremost, serve as a comprehensive reference document for LDCs, but ultimately for all developing countries and their partners.

Kemal Derviş
Administrator
United Nations
Development Programme

Anwarul K. Chowdhury
UN Under-Secretary-General and
High Representative for the Least
Developed Countries, Landlocked
Developing Countries and Small Island
Developing States

# Acknowledgements

This Report is a product of a collective effort and it could have not been written without the generous contributions of many individuals and organizations throughout the process. The original idea was an initiative of the then UNDP Administrator, Mark Malloch Brown, and UN Under-Secretary-General and High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States, Mr. Anwarul K. Chowdhury, who commissioned their teams to undertake the work. The UN-OHRLLS team was led by Zahra Nuru. Shoji Nishimoto, Assistant Administrator and Director, Bureau for Development Policy, UNDP provided strategic guidance to the Democratic Governance Team to implement the work. The UNDP team was led by Gita Welch.

The Report benefited greatly from the intellectual advice and guidance provided by the readers and members of the advisory panel who shared their knowledge and expertise from LDC governance experiences and practice. In particular, we want to acknowledge G. Shabbir Cheema, Ayesha Dias, Andrew Ellis, Nader Fergany, Andrea Goodman, Charles Gore, Jak Jabes, Selim Jahan, James Katorobo, Sheila Kawamara-Mishambi, Jocelyn Mason, Haroub Othman, Irene Ovonji-Odida, Therese Pearce Laanela, Marie Pedersen, Rini Reza, Jean Claude Rogivue, Sima Samar, Patrick Van Weerelt and Kanni Wignaraja, all of whom provided thoughtful and extensive written comments to different drafts of this Report.

We extend our thanks to several individuals who shared data and other research material, reviewed statistical material and provided invaluable information and assistance to the writing team. They include Iyad Abumoghli, Jacob Assa, Mathew Bells, Giske Charlotte, Martin Chungong, Juan Cruz Perusia, Haishan Fu, Ricardo Fuentes, Linda Ghanime, Chiara Giamberardini, Claes Johansson, Christopher Kuonqui, Linda Maguire, Elizabeth McCall, Andres Montes, Joachim Nahem, Stephen N. Ndegwa, Gonca Okur-Buffington, Christian Oxenboll, Chandra Roy, Petter Stalenheim, Edo Stork, Kevin Watkins and Shahin Yaqub.

Many individuals and institutions were consulted during the year-long preparation of this Report. From January to March 2005, several colleagues from UNDP and other UN agencies participated in working sessions oriented to pin-point major issues, trends and best practices in LDCs. We are grateful to the following individuals who graciously provided their time and knowledge to the writing team: Joseph Annan, Jide Balogun, Sam Barnes, Marie-Ange Bunga, Randi Davis, Peter Lunding, Magdy Martinez-Soliman, Alphonse Mekolo, Thord Palmlund, Kadmiel Wekwete, Robertson Work, Atsushi Yamanaka and Raul Zambrano. Also, we want to thank the regional bureaus of Africa, Arab States and Asia for meeting with us and providing valuable inputs to the Report. In particular, we would like to thank Musinga T. Bandora and Rini Reza for sharing with us their analysis of the main regional issues affecting LDCs.

LDCs Resident Representatives and Senior Officers of UNDP were consulted by the writing team at the beginning of the process, through questionnaires, and in later stages by requesting feedback from more complete drafts. The feedback from the country offices allowed the writing team to obtain first-hand information and analysis. We are particularly grateful to M. Moustapha Soumare (Benin), Nileema Noble (Ethiopia),

Moez Doraid (Maldives), Cécile Molinier (Mauritania), Bineswaree Bolaky (São Tomé and Principe), Chris Johnson (South Sudan) and Emilie Kpakpo (Togo)

On 18 July 2005, we held the first round of consultations with the LDCs National Focal Points. We particularly would like to thank the following individuals who attended the workshop: Mr. Jacinto Rangel Neto (Angola), Mr. Kazi Delwar Hossain (Bangladesh), Mr. Eric Emmanual Adjou (Benin), Mr. Jambay Wangchuck (Bhutan), Mr. Fofana Idrissa (Burkina Faso), Mr. Térence Ntabangana (Burundi), Mr. Ou Orhat (Cambodia), Mr. Alcides Barros (Cape Verde), Mr. Diba Basile (Central African Republic), Mr. Manasset Guealbaye (Chad), Mr. Mhadjou Chamsoudine (Comoros), Mr. Rachid Ekanza-Ezokola (Democratic Republic of the Congo), Mr. Simon Mibrathu (Djibouti), Mr. Momodou Jobe (Gambia), Ms. Antonia Gomes (Guinea-Bissau), Mr. Christian Toussaint (Haiti), Mr. Saleumxay Kommasith (Lao People's Democratic Republic), Mr. Modeste Raveloson (Madagascar), Mr. Charles Kambuwauwa (Malawi), Mr. Asim Ahmed (Maldives), Mr. Ballo Boubacar (Mali), Mr. Abdel Kader Ould Mohamed Mahmoud (Mauritania), Ms. Reino Francisca A. T. (Mozambique), Mr. Iro Souley (Niger), Mr. A. Kayitayire (Rwanda), Mrs. Noumea Simi (Samoa), Mr. Adama Dieye (Senegal), Mrs. Abie E. Kamara (Sierra Leone), Mrs. Jane Waetara (Solomon Islands), Mr. Yassin Eisa Mohamed (Sudan), Mr. Odaye Komlanvi (Togo), Ms. Limasene Teatu (Tuvalu), Mr. Longino Tisasirana (Uganda), Mr. Mrango Herbert Eliad (United Republic of Tanzania) and Mr. Kalfau Kaloris (Vanuatu). At this consultation, we were fortunate to have four panelists from different agencies who provided valuable inputs on the governance challenges and opportunities of LDCs. The panelists included Alphonse Mekolo (United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs – UNDESA), Alessandro Motter (Inter-Parliamentary Union – IPU), Ejeviome Eloho Otobo (Office of the Special Adviser on Africa – OSAA) and Kadmiel Wekwete (United Nations Capital Development Fund – UNCDF).

On 26 September 2005, UNDP and UN-OHRLLS organized a dialogue and consultation process on governance with the 50 Ambassadors and Permanent Representatives of the LDCs at the United Nations. We extend our thanks to the Ambassadors who attended the dialogue and consultation process. In particular, we are grateful for the contributions of the chair, High Representative Mr. Anwarul K. Chowdhury, and the panelists: Mr. Ismael Abraao Gaspar Martins (Ambassador from Angola), Mr. Alounkeo Kittikhoun (Ambassador from the Lao People's Democratic Republic), Mr. Augustin Mahiga (Ambassador from the United Republic of Tanzania) and Mr. Leo Merores (Ambassador from Haiti). Also participating in consultation process was Prof. Mala Htun from the New School for Social Research in New York. Furthermore, we want to explicitly acknowledge the valuable contributions from the Ambassadors from Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Benin, Cambodia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Mali and Nepal during the consultation process.

The Report benefited from the work of our editor, Jeff Hoover. The cover and layout design were done by Ferro+Ferro Graphic Communication. Guidance and assistance in producing, translating and distributing the Report were provided by UNDP's Communication Office, especially from Rajeswary Iruthayanathan and Maureen Lynch. Also, Adam Rogers, from UNCDF, and Marta Jaksona from HDRO provided helpful advice and ideas on production matters of editing, design, printing and distribution. We received prompt feedback from Sarah Burd-Sharps from HDRO, on requests for infor-

mation. Katherin Golitzen provided useful editorial suggestions and advice. We acknowledge with gratitude, the assistance of the following colleagues who facilitated the approval of documents in their various units: Josephine Amara-Bangali, Vineet Bhatia, Astrid Bissainthe, Georgina Fekete, Douglas Keh, and Rosemary Nuamah.

The Report also benefited from the dedicated work of Johanna B. Fine, who provided substantive inputs to the writing team while doing an internship at UNDP.

For the final review of the report, we are especially grateful for insightful comments and suggestions from , G. Shabbir Cheema, Andrew Ellis, Bjoern Foerde, Carlos Lopes, Elizabeth McCall, Therese Pearce Laanela, Mark Suzman, and the CSO Unit in BRSP. We also appreciate the comments provided by the Office of the Administrator. The final revision benefited from continuous production support from Mark Blitzer, the meticulous assistance of Reinhold Elges and proof-reading by Jessica Lieberman.

The team would like to thank Mr. Anwarul K. Chowdhury, UN Under-Secretary General and High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States, whose expertise was essential in guiding and advising the team on the substantial issues for LDCs. In addition, we want to acknowledge the critical support from UN-OHRLLS during the consultation process. In particular, we would like to thank Nelly Ahouilihoua, Raul de Melo Cabral, Aba Davis, Eder Garcia, Shuang Hu, Nosh Nalavala, Om Pradhan, Carol Sakubita, and Harriet Schmidt. The UN Conference Services provided efficient and timely logistical support and translation services to the Ambassadors' Consultation Meeting on September 26th. We thank also Roselyn Odera for her promptness and willingness to assist, in our request for suggestions for speakers with gender specialization.

The LDC Report has been funded by UNDP's Democratic Governance Thematic Trust Fund (DGTTF). Generous contributions from the Governments of Germany, the Netherlands and Norway made the effort possible.

Finally, we want to thank Tenagne Getahun and Libby Gutierrez from UNDP's Democratic Governance Group, both of whom provided essential administrative support.

Gita Welch
Practice Leader and Director
Democratic Governance Group

Zahra Nuru
Director and Senior Advisor
UN-OHRLLS

# LDC Report Preparation Process

Preliminary research and consultation: Based on the concept note, from December to March 2005 the LDC team mapped governance indicators, reviewed existing literature, and developed preliminary LDC trends for each DGG service line, plus trends on HIV/AIDS, post-conflict, and gender. The LDC Team carried out personal interviews with policy advisors for each service line of the Democratic Governance Group. It also distributed a written questionnaire and consulted electronically with the UNDP Resident Representatives in the 50 LDCs. Consultations continued during the Johannesburg Meeting in January 2005.

**LDC Retreat:** The LDC team held a retreat on 14-18 March 2005. During this week, LDC team reviewed trends and held working sessions on each of the service lines of DGG, other UNDP practices (HIV/AIDS, poverty, conflict, environment), indicators specialists from HDRO and the Oslo Governance Center, the UNDP Regional Bureaus, as well as from members from other relevant UN offices: UNDESA, UNCDF, UN-OHRLLS. Representatives from UNDP Regional Bureaus were present in one of the working sessions of Africa, Asia and the Pacific, Arab States, and Latin America and the Caribbean.

**Zero Draft** (Annotate Outline): On the basis of the retreat discussions on the concept note, preliminary literature reviews, inputs from background interview with various service line advisors, the team drafted an initial annotated report outline on 23 March 2005. The first 'Zero Draft' (Annotated Outline) was ready on 13 April 2005 and thereafter reviewed for in-house and intra-team comments.

**Yellow Draft:** Relevant documents were reviewed and chapter themes elaborated upon in May, and the first Yellow draft was presented to the fellow LDC team members on 23 May for review and comments. The revised yellow draft version was circulated to the Readers Group on 6 June 2005. Simultaneously, yellow draft was also shared with UN-OHRLLS. Comments from Readers Group were received at the end of June 2005.

**Blue Draft:** Based on the comments from the Readers Group and the consultation process with LDC Focal Points on 18 July 2005 (see more information below), the LDC Team worked during the summer to prepare the blue draft due on 30 August 2005. Blue draft was circulated to the Readers Group and Advisors Group again on September 2005, as well as to the UNDP Resident Representatives in the 50 LDCs and to UN-OHRLLS. Comments to the Blue draft were received at the end of September 2005. Besides the above mentioned readers, the blue draft was circulated among the Advisors Group.

**Red Draft:** Based on the comments on the blue draft, the LDC report team further revised the text and statistical analysis of the report in October and November when the text was distributed to BDP, UNDP Office of the Administrator and UN-OHRLLS for comments. The statistical part of the report was shared with HDRO for comments.

Besides the consultation of readers and advisors on the different draft of the text, the LDC team engaged in additional consultations:

- Preliminary consultations: UNDP Resident Representatives in the 50 LDCs, DGG policy advisors for each service line, Johannesburg Meeting.
- LDC Team Retreat: organized by DGG. Process mentioned above.

- LDC Focal Points: Jointly organized by UN-OHRLLS and UNDP on 18 July 2005. On 18 July 2005, the first round of consultations with the LDCs National Focal Points was held. These session discussed the challenges and opportunities to achievement commitment 2 of the Brussels Programme of Action. The consultation/dialogue with LDC focal points included panelists from different agencies.
- LDC Ambassadors: Jointly organized by UN-OHRLLS and UNDP in September 2005.

This consultation dialogue was organized to bring together the Ambassadors and High Representatives of the LDCs, in an interactive forum for discussing the governance challenges in the LDCs. The event was well attended by the Ambassadors and their country's representatives, who accepted the invitation to participate in a panel-led dialogue on good governance, and to share with their peers, the experiences of their own countries. This consultation event was a key stage in the preparation of the LDC report. The LDC report cites the opinions and observations of the government officials, to illustrate the reports' arguments on actual country experiences. These ranged from the importance of national leadership in ensuring that the vision for good governance translates to concrete action, to the question of partnerships between national and international partners in global governance.

# Table of Contents

**8 LDC Report preparation process**

**16 List of acronyms**

**19 Overview**

**31 Chapter One: Democratic governance for sustainable human development**

32 Introduction

33 The Brussels Programme of Action

34 Functions of government

35 Elements of good governance

36 Democratizing good governance

36 The human rights framework for democratic governance

38 Democratic governance: Good governance for human development

40 Challenges in democratic governance for LDCs

- 41 Cultural relativism
- 42 Post-conflict democracy
- 43 Gender in democratic governance
- 43 Assessing governance
- 44 Financing peace and post-conflict reconstruction
- 45 Financing institutions of democratic governance

**49 Chapter Two: State capacity**

50 Introduction

51 State capacity and the context for capacity development in LDCs

- 52 Necessary attributes of state institutions
- 53 Main developmental functions of state institutions

53 Recent trends in public administration reform in LDCs

- 57 Decentralization: Participatory and accountable local-level institutions

59 Capacity of state institutions to address governance challenges

- 60 Capacity for monitoring and evaluation
- 60 Performance management and accountability for results
- 63 Budget and expenditure management
- 64 Capacity to explore new approaches and innovate
- 64 Transparency, accountability and fighting corruption

70 Capacity of state Institutions to address economic challenges

- 72 Priority and objective setting
- 72 Policy analysis and policy formulation
- 74 Monitoring and evaluation
- 74 Engaging with external partners

75 Capacity of state institutions to address human development needs

- 75 Effective public-service delivery in the face of fiscal constrains

**87 Chapter Three: Non-state actors**
88 Introduction
88 Civil society contributions to democratic governance in LDCs
89 Civic participation and parliamentary development
92 Civil society and political parties
92 Ensuring state transparency and accountability — a watchdog role of civil society
95 Civil society's role in communication, information dissemination and awareness building
98 Addressing economic and human development challenges in LDCs — civil society's role
98 Influencing policy debates and policy formulation
100 Providing basic social services
103 Civil society's role in environmental sustainability
104 Limitations and challenges of civil society in LDCs
105 The private sector
107 Private-sector contributions
108 Constraints to private-sector development in LDCs
110 Public-private partnerships
112 External development partners
112 Economic and human development challenges
113 Governance challenges
114 External development partners and civil society

**117 Chapter Four: Rule of law, human rights and access to justice**
118 Introduction
119 Respecting international human rights instruments in LDCs
121 Strengthening national human rights institutions
124 Constitutions and laws
126 Rule of law and justice
127 Dual systems of justice
131 Access to justice
133 Strengthening judiciary
138 Reforming criminal-justice systems
143 Monitoring the rule of law and human rights
143 Monitoring rule of law and human rights — international level
144 Monitoring rule of law and human rights — national level

**147 Chapter Five: Global governance and the LDCs**
148 Introduction
148 Global development challenges for LDCs — forms and nature
149 Global disparities
149 Trade barriers and distortions

151 Flow of financial and human resources
153 Debt burden and debt relief
154 HIV/AIDS and global governance
155 Armed conflict
156 Global environmental issues
157 Global 'bads'
158 Global governance structure and LDCs
158 Unfavourable rules and insufficient representation
159 Ineffective participation
162 Restructuring global governance — strategies and reforms
162 New perspectives
163 Renewed strategies
163 Trade and market access
166 Resource mobilization
166 Migration and brain drain
167 Global environmental concerns
167 Inter-country consortium for transnational highways for landlocked countries
168 Regional migration framework
169 Regional and sub-regional common standards
169 Institutional reforms
169 Increased engagement with civil society
169 Sub-regional legal aid centre for trade negotiations
170 Reforms in Bretton Woods institutions
171 Reforming WTO

**Boxes**

35 Box 1.1 Core characteristics of good governance
37 Box 1.2 General Assembly resolution promoting and consolidating democracy through good governance and sustainable development
39 Box 1.3 Democratic governance as good governance for sustainable development
58 Box 2.1 Decentralization: Lessons from the Ugandan experience
62 Box 2.2 Performance pay and compensation reforms in Cambodia and Afghanistan
66 Box 2.3 The Democratic Republic of the Congo: Natural resource curse, conflict and corruption
71 Box 2.4 Botswana Directorate on Corruption and Economic Crime (DCEC)
71 Box 2.5 Effective urban service delivery: Burkina Faso's innovative arrangement in sanitation management
78 Box 2.6 Centrality of physical infrastructure in development: Water provisioning in rural Bangladesh
81 Box 2.7 Selected success stories of service delivery in HIV/AIDS situations
85 Box 2.8 Mozambique: Evolution of a disaster management structure

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 90 | Box 3.1 | Citizen education programme in Zambia |
| 94 | Box 3.2 | Civil society in anti-corruption efforts: Initiative to monitor oil revenues in Chad |
| 97 | Box 3.3 | People First Network: ICT for rural development in the Solomon Islands |
| 100 | Box 3.4 | Communal latrines in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia |
| 101 | Box 3.5 | Uganda: HIV/AIDS and the positive effects of public-private partnership |
| 102 | Box 3.6 | Creating partnerships with civil society: Senegal's Local Initiative Facility for Urban Environment (LIFE) |
| 103 | Box 3.7 | Community management of urban environment in Senegal |
| 106 | Box 3.8 | What constitutes the private sector |
| 108 | Box 3.9 | Pit-emptying services in the United Republic of Tanzania: Private-sector involvement |
| 111 | Box 3.10 | The Adopt-an-Island Initiative: Public and private partnerships in Maldives |
| 113 | Box 3.11 | Support by external development partners towards political transition in Haiti |
| 128 | Box 4.1 | Malawi and Mozambique: Land rights |
| 130 | Box 4.2 | Rwanda: Innovative mechanisms in the search for justice |
| 134 | Box 4.3 | Yemen: Modernization of the judiciary |
| 135 | Box 4.4 | Sierra Leone: Campaign for good governance |
| 137 | Box 4.5 | Expatriate and mobile judges in LDCs |
| 139 | Box 4.6 | Experiences with transitional justice: Truth Commissions in Sierra Leone and Timor-Leste |
| 141 | Box 4.7 | Policing and gender concerns: Some positive measures |
| 160 | Box 5.1 | 2005 World Summit Outcomes |
| 165 | Box 5.2 | Regional cooperation among LDCs: Some examples |


**Graphs**


| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 34 | Graph 1.1 | Trends in GDP per capita for all LDCs, 1981-2004 |
| 34 | Graph 1.2 | Trends in life expectancy for all LDCs, 1980-2005 |


**Tables**


| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 46 | Table 1.1 | Electoral systems in LDCs |
| 89 | Table 3.1 | Voter education programmes for minorities and other groups in selected LDCs |
| 123 | Table 4.1 | Status (as of May 2005) of national human rights institutions in LDCs |
| 133 | Table 4.2 | Pre-trial detainees in selected LDCs |
| 149 | Table 5.1 | Average tariffs (%) imposed by developed countries on goods commonly produced in LDCs |
| 151 | Table 5.2 | Net ODA to LDCs, 1990-2002 |
| 152 | Table 5.3 | Estimated MDG investment needs and financing gaps (in 2003 US$) in Asia-Pacific LDCs |
| 154 | Table 5.4 | Per capita outstanding debt and debt relief granted to LDCs, 2002 |
| 158 | Table 5.5 | Global institutions and their membership |
| 158 | Table 5.6 | Voting power in Bretton Woods institutions |

**Figures**

119 Figure 4.1 LDCs ratifications of major international human rights instruments

**173 Text glossary**

**185 Bibliography**

**219 Statistical annex**

222 Table 1 LDCs – basic features
224 Table 2 LDCs – status of human development (key indicators)
226 Table 3 LDCs – profile of human deprivation (key indicators)
230 Table 4 LDCs – access to basic social services
232 Table 5 LDCs – economic performance
236 Table 6 LDCs – support from rich countries (members of OECD's Development Assistance Committee)
237 Table 7 LDCs – human security
238 Table 8 LDCs – gender indicators
240 Table 9 LDC – international treaties
242 Table 10 Governance in LDCs
246 Table 11 Political representation in LDCs

**Country profiles**

248 Afghanistan
250 Angola
252 Bangladesh
254 Benin
256 Bhutan
258 Burkina Faso
260 Burundi
262 Cambodia
264 Cape Verde
266 Central African Republic
268 Chad
270 Comoros
272 Democratic Republic of the Congo
274 Djibouti
276 Equatorial Guinea
278 Eritrea
280 Ethiopia
282 Gambia
284 Guinea
286 Guinea-Bissau
288 Haiti
290 Kiribati

292 Lao People's Democratic Republic
294 Lesotho
296 Liberia
298 Madagascar
300 Malawi
302 Maldives
304 Mali
306 Mauritania
308 Mozambique
310 Myanmar
312 Nepal
314 Niger
316 Rwanda
318 Samoa
320 São Tomé and Principe
322 Senegal
324 Sierra Leone
326 Solomon Islands
328 Somalia
330 Sudan
332 Timor-Leste
334 Togo
336 Tuvalu
338 Uganda
340 United Republic of Tanzania
342 Vanuatu
344 Yemen
346 Zambia

**348 Statistical glossary**
**359 Indicators source**
**364 Statistical references**

# List of acronyms

| | |
|---|---|
| **ADB** | Asian Development Bank |
| **AIDS** | acquired immune deficiency syndrome |
| **AGOA** | African Growth Opportunity Act |
| **APRM** | African Peer Review Mechanism |
| **ARTF** | Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Fund |
| **ASEAN** | Association of Southeast Asian Nations |
| **AU** | African Union |
| **BPoA** | Brussels Programme of Action |
| **BRAC** | Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee |
| **CDP** | Committee for Development Policy |
| **CEDAW** | Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women |
| **CRC** | Convention on the Rights of the Child |
| **CSO(s)** | civil society organization(s) |
| **DAC** | Development Assistance Committee (of the OECD) |
| **DCEC** | Botswana Directorate on Corruption and Economic Crime |
| **DOD** | debt outstanding and disbursed |
| **DRM** | disaster risk management |
| **EBA** | Everything but Arms |
| **ECOSOC** | United Nations Economic and Social Council |
| **EVI** | economic vulnerability index |
| **FDI** | foreign direct investment |
| **GDI** | gender development index |
| **GDP** | gross domestic product |
| **GEF** | Global Environment Facility |
| **GEO** | Global Environment Outlook |
| **GNI** | gross national income |
| **GNP** | gross national product |
| **GSP** | Generalized System of Preferences |
| **GTSP** | Global System of Trade Preferences among Developing Countries |
| **HDI** | human development index |
| **HIPC(s)** | heavily indebted poor country(ies) |
| **HIV** | human immunodeficiency virus |
| **HNP** | Haitian National Police |
| **HPI -1** | human poverty index – 1 |
| **ICPS** | International Center for Prison Studies |
| **ICT** | information and communication technology |
| **ICTR** | International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda |
| **ICVS** | International Crime Victim Survey |
| **IDEA** | International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance |
| **IDP** | internally displaced people |

| | |
|---|---|
| **ILO** | International Labour Organization |
| **IMF** | International Monetary Fund |
| **INGC** | National Institute for Disaster Management |
| **IPU** | inter-parliamentary union |
| **LDC(s)** | Least Developed Country(ies) |
| **LEGED** | Local Government Engineering Department |
| **LIFE** | Local Initiative Facility for the Urban Environment |
| **MDG(s)** | Millennium Development Goal(s) |
| **MICIVIH** | International Civilian Mission in Haiti, OAS/UN |
| **NAG** | National Accountability Group |
| **NAPAs** | national adaptation plans of actions |
| **NGO(s)** | non-governmental organization(s) |
| **NEPAD** | New Partnership for Africa's Development |
| **NHDR(s)** | national human development report(s) |
| **NHRI(s)** | national human rights institution(s) |
| **NPM** | new public management |
| **OAS** | Organization of American States |
| **ODA** | official development assistance |
| **OECD** | Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development |
| **PAR** | public administration reform |
| **PFM** | public finance management |
| **PMS** | political mobilization strategy |
| **PPP** | purchasing power parity |
| **PRR** | Priority Reform and Restructuring Initiative |
| **PRSs** | poverty reduction strategies |
| **PRSPs** | poverty reduction strategy papers |
| **RAA** | Royal Audit Authority |
| **RENLAC** | Réseau National de Lutte Anti-corruption |
| **SAARC** | South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation |
| **SAFTA** | South Asian Free Trade Area |
| **SAPTA** | SAARC Preferential Trading Arrangement |
| **SARS** | severe acute respiratory syndrome |
| **SHD** | sustainable human development |
| **SIPRI** | Stockholm International Peace Research Institute |
| **SITC** | Standard International Trade Classification |
| **STD(s)** | sexual transmitted disease(s) |
| **TIRI** | governance-access-learning network |
| **TLPS** | Timor Lorosa's Police Service |
| **TRIPS** | Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights |
| **UAC** | Uganda AIDS Commission |
| **UNAIDS** | Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS |
| **UNCCD** | United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification |
| **UNCTAD** | United Nations Conference on Trade and Development |

| | |
|---|---|
| **UND** | Uganda Debt Network |
| **UNDP** | United Nations Development Programme |
| **UN ECA** | United Nations Economic Commission for Africa |
| **UNESCAP** | United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific |
| **UNESCO** | United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization |
| **UN-HABITAT** | United Nations Human Settlements Programme |
| **UNHCR** | United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees |
| **UNICEF** | United Nations Children's Fund |
| **UNIFEM** | United Nations Development Fund for Women |
| **UNODC** | United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime |
| **UN-OHRLLS** | United Nations Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing Countries |
| **UNCAC** | United Nations Convention against Corruption |
| **UPU** | United Postal Union |
| **USAID** | US Agency for International Development |
| **WDI** | World Development Indicators |
| **WFP** | World Food Programme |
| **WHO** | World Health Organization |
| **WIDER** | World Institute for Development Economics Research |
| **WOLA** | Washington Office for Latin America |
| **WTO** | World Trade Organization |

# Overview

# Introduction

The Outcome Document of the 2005 World Millennium Summit[1] reaffirmed the commitment of world leaders and the international community to address the special needs of the Least Developed Countries (LDCs), which continue to face persistent human development challenges. As part of that effort, all relevant organizations of the United Nations system, including the Bretton Woods institutions, were urged to make concerted efforts and adopt speedy measures for meeting the goals and targets of the Brussels Programme of Action (BPoA)[2] in a timely manner.

The BPoA aims to enhance the ability of LDCs to make progress toward meeting the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), in particular the goal of halving the proportion of people living in extreme poverty by 2015, and in promoting sustainable development in LDCs.

**Achieving the objectives and goals of the BPoA by 2010 would require increased efforts by LDCs, scaled-up official development assistance, full debt cancellation, fair trade and enhanced assistance from donors**

According to a report submitted by the UN Secretary-General to the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) in May 2005,[3] despite significant progress by some LDCs at an individual level, their progress as a group "has been insufficient to meet the goals of the Brussels Programme of Action and its objectives of eradicating poverty, sustained growth and sustainable development."[4] The Secretary-General's report identified weakness in three areas — country ownership, national capacity and resources — as the major obstacles that persistently hamper implementation of the Programme of Action. In particular, the report stressed that achieving the objectives and goals of the BPoA by 2010 would require increased efforts by LDCs, scaled-up official development assistance, full debt cancellation, fair trade and enhanced technical assistance from donors, and more extensive tapping of the enormous potential of South-South and triangular cooperation.

Underlying these recommendations is the recognition that good governance is vital for the eradication of poverty, progress toward achieving the MDGs and the attainment of sustainable human development. It is therefore logical that this Report, *Governance for the Future: Democracy and Development in the Least Developed Countries*, results from a collaborative effort between two specific United Nations organizations: the Office of the High Representative for Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States (UN-OHRLLS)[5], which is mandated to ensuring effective implementation of the BPoA, and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), whose mission is to help developing countries achieve the MDGs for sustainable human development.

---

[1] United Nations General Assembly, "World Summit Outcome," 20 September 2005, A/60/L.1. Online: http://www.un.org/summit2005/documents.html.

[2] The BPoA (officially known as the Programme of Action for Least Developed Countries for the Decade 2001-2010) was adopted by the Third United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries on 20 May 2001 in Brussels, Belgium.

[3] The United Nations Substantive Session of the ECOSOC, held on 23 May 2005, reviewed the coordination of the implementation of the BPoA for LDCs. United Nations, "Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries for the Decade 2001-2010; Report of the Secretary-General," A/60/81-E/2005/68, 23 May 2005.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Established on the recommendation of the UN Secretary-General by the General Assembly in its R 56/227, 24 December 2001.

## The Brussels Programme of Action 2001-2010

The Brussels Programme of Action (BPoA) 2001-2010, adopted in June 2001 at the Third UN Conference on LDCs, articulates policies and supportive actions to promote the long-term economic growth and sustainable human development of LDCs and their successful integration into the global economy. The BPoA is a global partnership that aims to develop the human and institutional resources needed to accelerate economic growth and eradicate poverty, inequality and deprivation in the 50 LDCs, and to ensure human security for the more than 600 million people living in them. The BPoA is, therefore, integral to the achievement of the Millenium Development Goals (MDGs).

International attention toward LDCs dates back nearly 40 years, with their recognition as the most vulnerable group of developing countries in the late 1960s and the International Development Strategy for the Second UN Development Decade, which highlighted special measures for LDCs. In 1981, the First UN Conference on LDCs was held in Paris, resulting in the Substantial New Programme of Action. The Second UN Conference on LDCs resulted in the Paris Declaration and Programme of Action for the Decade in 1990. The two previous Programmes of Action from Paris, announced in 1981 and 1990, have remained largely unattained. Meanwhile, the number of LDCs rose over that same period from 24 to 50, and only one of the original members — Botswana — has been able to graduate.

In an effort to increase its potential for success, the Brussels Programme of Action 2001 varies from previous LDC programmes of action in terms of the objectives, orientation, scope and arrangements for follow-up. In general, the BPoA focuses on achieving substantial progress for LDCs in meeting the MDGs of halving poverty by 2015 and promoting sustainable development. Conference attendees in 2001 identified the seven following steps, which eventually became known as commitments, toward those goals:

- fostering a people-centred policy framework;
- good governance at the national and international levels;
- building human and institutional capacities;
- building productive capacities to make globalization work for LDCs;
- enhancing the role of trade and development;
- reducing vulnerability and protecting the environment; and
- mobilizing financial resources.

Against the backdrop of lack of progress in socioeconomic development in LDCs and the implementation of the Programme of Action for the 1990s, the Brussels Programme of Action emphasizes that the development process should be viewed in a comprehensive, coherent and long-term manner by LDCs and their partners. The expectation is that increased scope for more effective dialogue will ensue from greater alignment between LDCs' national policies and strategies and the external assistance of their partners. Open and transparent development cooperation, underpinned by strong political will, can support substantial transformation in LDCs. Success will depend on effective follow-up and implementation, monitoring and review at national, regional and global levels.

Of the seven areas of action under BPoA, four relate directly to governance: 1) fostering people-centred action; 2) promoting good governance at the national and international levels; 3) building human and institutional capacities; and 4) mobilizing financial resources, including official development assistance (ODA).

These priorities recognize that in addition to the external factors that influence the prospects for growth and development in every LDC, democratic governance at the local, national and global levels is paramount for the achievement of human development, security and the protection of human rights. The notions of good governance embedded in the BPoA are broadly conceptualized, primarily covering the State, civil society, and the private sector, but also acknowledging regional and international relations that constitute global governance.

# Why a report on governance in LDCs?

This Report is intended as a comprehensive reference document that identifies and analyzes key issues related to the realization of Commitment 2 of the BPoA. It is premised on the centrality of democratic governance for poverty eradication and sustainable human development in this specific group of 50 countries, that according to criteria of income, human resources, and economic vulnerability qualify for inclusion as LDCs. It focuses on governance challenges facing LDCs, and it discusses the root causes of some of them. It addresses ways in which extreme poverty greatly limits efforts to improve the quality of life of people living in these countries. The Report examines how LDCs' economic and social development represents a major challenge for themselves as well as for their development partners and the rest of the international community in a globalized world. It summarizes how LDCs' structural economic weakness and endemic lack of human institutional and productive capacity often compound inherent geographic handicaps. The Report also sets out to illustrate how some of the most efficient and creative solutions in overcoming development problems can be found in LDCs themselves.

A key role of the United Nations is to help countries achieve their own developmental goals. Therefore, the goal of this Report is neither to rank countries according to their perceived or real efforts toward creating the conditions for more rapid development through better governance, nor to prescribe what LDCs must do to ensure poverty eradication, good governance and democracy. The vast work experience of the United Nations on the ground has firmly reinforced the assumption that democracy and democratic governance cannot be "legislated" into a country's governance practice, nor can democratic governance be imposed from the outside. The UN as an institution agrees instead that each country needs to create its own indigenous durable solutions for alleviating human poverty, human deprivation and underdevelopment, in accordance with its own realities and the way in which those realities interplay with the external environment.

This Report is an updated reference for governments, civil society organizations, the private sector and other development stakeholders in LDCs; UN development practitioners; and the international community at large. Its five chapters focus on democratic governance, the linkages between governance and poverty, the role of state and non-state actors, the rule of law and global governance.

**The central message of the Report is that although not sufficient on its own, good governance is indispensable for countries to sustain progress over the longer term.**

Moving beyond economic growth to human development requires that political and economic freedoms are backed by human rights; this underpinning helps ensure that the means and ends of good governance are more fully recognized, accepted and supported by the population.[6]

[6] The linkages between good governance and democratic governance are explained in Chapter 1. Most definitions of democratic governance are tautological, in referring to democratic institutions and processes. This is one reason that this Report has avoided using narrow definitions of democratic, and of good governance. Also, the Report does not apply a formulaic approach to governance, since governance is a dynamic concept. Rather, certain elements are present in good governance, and required for democratic governance. The conceptualization of democratic governance in this report has been developed from various UN statements and declarations on governance, democracy and human rights, from the UNDP position on democratic governance.

# The 'resources' factor

While many of the development challenges addressed in this Report are common to all developing countries, there are important distinctions in how they manifest themselves in the poorest countries (notably LDCs). The response to the devastation from HIV/AIDS, external economic shocks or natural disasters varies enormously, depending on whether a country is an LDC or not. For example, the HIV/AIDS pandemic in sub-Saharan Africa has severely depleted national capacities in health, education and agriculture far more extensively in LDCs than in non-LDCs. The international community has already initiated a number of initiatives aiming to address the triple threat crisis of food insecurity, weakened capacity for governance and HIV/AIDS. One is the Southern Africa Capacity Initiative (SACI), which represents UNDP's direct contribution to the UN system's efforts to develop a strategy to respond to the three interlocking challenges[7].

**The devastation from HIV/AIDS, external economic shocks or natural disasters varies enormously, depending on whether a country is an LDC or not.**

A country is classified as an LDC based on selected development indicators, including the following three criteria:[8]

- **income**: a three-year average estimate of the gross domestic product (GDP) per capita (under $750 for inclusion as an LDC, above $900 for graduation);[9]
- **human resources**: a composite augmented physical quality of life index, renamed in 2003 as the human assets index (HAI), based on indicators of nutrition, health, education and adult literacy; and
- **economic vulnerability**: a composite economic vulnerability index (EVI) based on the stability of agricultural production; the stability of exports of goods and services; the economic importance of non-traditional activities; merchandise export concentration; the extent of liabilities of economic smallness; and the percentage of population displaced by natural disasters.

Though LDCs represent a cluster of 50 countries, there are important factors that differentiate them in terms of the nature and degree of complexity of the problems they face and consequently also the types of solutions that are most appropriate and realistic to address them. Some of these factors have to do with the type and amount of resources available to a particular LDC, including resources that depend on the external global environment. Other factors have to do with the particular political history and structure of the country. The diversity of the LDC grouping can be better understood with reference to analytical characteristics such as: population size, island state, land-locked, conflict or post-conflict, debt burden, as examples.

The Permanent Representative of the Lao People's Democratic Republic (Lao PDR) to the United Nations illustrated some of the differentiating factors by pointing out that LDCs that are landlocked face additional obstacles to growth — what he called "the double challenge of distance and border-crossing." The challenge of distance refers to the 13 percent of the country's export earnings needed for payment of insurance and

[7] UN-OHRLLS (Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Islands Developing States) and UNDP (United Nations Development Programme), "Hoping and Coping: A Call for Action: The Capacity Challenge of HIV/AIDS in Least Developed Countries," 2005, p. 31.

[8] See www.un.org/special-rep/ohrlls/ldc/ldc%20criteria.htm and www.un.org/special-rep/ohrlls/ldc/E-2004-33.pdf.

[9] All currency amounts marked by "$" in this Report are US dollars.

transport services, compared with similar costs in non-landlocked developing countries totaling just seven percent).[10]

Poverty eradication can be hastened by shrinking and, eventually, eliminating such cost differentials. It is undoubtedly affected as well by access to resources. Most recent studies and international commitments emphasize the importance of increasing resources for combating poverty and creating sustainable development. The UN Millennium Project, directed by Jeffrey Sachs, has called for wealthy countries to double cumulative official development assistance (ODA) to low-income countries — from 0.25 percent of donor gross national income (GNI) in 2003 to around 0.44 percent in 2006 and 0.54 percent in 2015.[11] Moreover, in March 2005 the Commission for Africa, established by British Prime Minister Tony Blair, presented a report to the leaders of the Group of 8 (G8) and to the wider international community that proposed a larger, more comprehensive and better integrated package of aid designed to boost prosperity in.[12] Similarly, at the 2005 World Summit, world leaders were encouraged by recent commitments to substantial increases in ODA. Heads of State and Governments welcomed the increased resources that will become available on the establishment of timetables by many developed countries to achieve the target of 0.7 per cent of GNP for ODA by 2015 and to reach at least 0.5 per cent of GNP for ODA by 2010 as well as, pursuant to the BPoA, 0.15 per cent to 0.20 per cent for the least developed countries no later than 2010, and urge those developed countries that have not yet done so to make concrete efforts in this regard in accordance with their commitments.[13]

Additionally, international donors are committing increasingly significant proportions of their aid to direct budget support, especially in the cases of LDCs. Although the specific disbursement mechanisms may vary, all of the direct (or "general") budget support instruments give relatively large volumes of funds directly to a partner government, using its own allocation, procurement and accounting systems. These programmes mark a radical departure from most previous aid instruments, which commonly relied either on project-based aid or on forms of programme aid linked directly to the achievement of ex ante conditionalities.

Even if ODA to LDCs were to double in size immediately, however, it seems likely that efforts to improve development would be hamstrung by a lack of efficient, transparent and inclusive governance. Increases in ODA must be accompanied by substantial improvement in governance institutions and practices at both national and international levels.

Over the past two decades or so, there has been a shift in conventional wisdom regarding development — from considering the State to be the problem (and markets the solution) to the current emphasis on the importance of state institutions for creating sustainable development. The change stems from the inability of markets by themselves to

---

[10] The Representative's comments came during a consultation and briefing on governance among Ambassadors that was jointly organized by UNDP and UN-OHRLLS. The briefing took place on 26 September 2005 in New York.

[11] UN Millennium Project, "Investing in Development: A Practical Plan to Achieve the Millennium Development Goals." UN Millennium Project, 2005, Online: www.unmillenniumproject.org/reports/fullreport.htm.

[12] See www.commissionforafrica.org/.

[13] United Nations, General Assembly, "World Summit Outcome," 20 September 2005, A/60/L.1. Online: http://daccessdds.un.org/doc/UNDOC/LTD/N05/511/30/PDF/N0551130.pdf?OpenElement.

[14] Francis Fukuyama, *State Building: Governance and the World Order in the 21st Century*, Profile Books, 2004.

deliver social values of fairness, lawfulness and inclusive and transparent public management. As argued by the political economist Francis Fukuyama, "Economics…is powerful at explaining markets, but not institutions; it is generally poor at accounting for the value of any human activity that cannot be reduced to shopping — and few can." In his most recent book, Fukuyama contended that encouraging good governance, whenever possible, is vital because "while ten bright technocrats can be air-dropped into a developing country and bring about massive changes for the better in public policy […] there is no legal system in the world that can be fixed by ten technocrats, no matter how bright."[14]

Furthermore, good governance cannot be discussed without also acknowledging power relations and national leadership. In LDCs, as in most nations, the commitment of those holding the levers of power can make a crucial difference in terms of promoting change and progress. Equally important are the quality and scope of relations among all state actors as well as their relations with non-state actors.

Training and education are essential to create state institutions that are embedded with principles of efficiency, transparency and accountability — and these principles can only take root with the support of enlightened and determined leadership. Good leadership can guide governments to carry out policies that respond to the needs of all members in society. Good leaders develop and initiate policies that acknowledge the security of the State as well as of the people living there; they are thus more likely to place priority on a functioning rule of law; important social services like education and health; and a framework conducive to economic growth. They ensure effective arteries of commerce and enshrine personal and human freedoms. They empower civil society and protect the environment.

**Despite the fact that most LDCs are now multiparty democracies and have made important advances in electoral processes, effective checks and balances between the different powers of the State still need to be strengthened.**

Fortunately, there are a handful of leaders in LDCs who have in recent years espoused the ethics of good governance and the promotion of human development. For example, the Heads of State and Government of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), meeting at the Tenth ASEAN Summit in the Lao PDR in November 2004, adopted the Vientiane Action Programme (VAP) 2004-2010, which has important implications for LDCs in the ASEAN region.[15]

Examples of this new type of leadership have also been developing in Africa. In June 2005, fifteen African former Heads of State and Government undertook an initiative in Bamako, Mali, aimed at addressing the urgent challenges of the continent. The Bamako Declaration calls for democracy and peaceful transfer of power to "ensure sustainable peace, security, economic growth and social wellbeing."[16] In this declaration, the former leaders committed to continue serving their countries by promoting dialogue, peaceful resolution of conflicts and democratic governance. The Bamako Declaration is an example of leadership that embraces constitutional rule and democratic governance processes and institutions as the way to face changes in power and political succession, as well as to deal with conflict.

This Report considers the importance of effective separation of powers between the different branches of government. Despite the fact that most LDCs are now multiparty democracies and have made important advances in electoral processes, effective checks and balances between the different powers of the State still need to be strengthened. The

[15] See www.aseansec.org/VAP-10th%20ASEAN%20Summit.pdf.

[16] African Statesmen Initiative, Bamako Declaration, 8 June 2005, Bamako, Mali. Online: www.ndi.org/asi/about/declaration/bamako_declaration.pdf.

lack of clear separation and independence among the branches of government hampers the ability, right and responsibility of each branch to monitor the others. Often, the executive branch in LDCs is much more powerful than the legislative and judicial ones. This clear lack of balance limits the ability of each entity to use its authority to effectively carry out its defined functions.

The legislative branch frequently is unable to fulfil its duties given the severe lack of human and financial resources. It also suffers from lack of representation, autonomy and financial independence. Thus, parliaments are often helpless in the face of direct pressure from executive branches, and their authority can be weakened when bypassed during important decision-making processes such as trade negotiations and determining poverty reduction strategies.[17]

Similarly, judicial independence is central to guaranteeing the application of the rule of law and the overall accountability of state and non-state actors. Judicial systems are often undermined by structural inabilities entrenched in the system, inadequate financial and operational resources, and subordination to executive power.

**Developmental challenges cannot be addressed by the State alone; other non-state agents, including civil society organizations and the private sector, are key stakeholders for sustainable development and democratic governance.**

This Report reiterates the fact that developmental challenges cannot be addressed by the State alone; other non-state agents, including civil society organizations and the private sector, are key stakeholders for sustainable development and democratic governance. However, non-state agents also face their own multiple challenges and constraints in LDCs and must, therefore, be seen as partners with, not substitutes for the State. Moreover, the activities of non-state agents should be framed by the principles of democratic governance.

Most LDCs require aid in their efforts to overcome economic, human development and governance challenges. The inadequacy of external support can manifest itself in various forms. Donors may be insensitive to national priorities and inflexible in the mechanisms they use to provide support, and their support may be inadequate, uncoordinated and overburdened with conditionalities. External development partners often forget that their role is that of a catalyst in the development process. They should respect national aspirations and priorities and should be sensitive to local realities. Failure to do so often leads to duplication of effort and activities and the setting up of non-pragmatic targets. A lack of donor coordination in many LDCs can also have a negative impact on requests for external support.

Adequate, relevant and effective financial support from external partners is a major governance issue for LDCs. The issue of inadequacy is addressed in this Report in the context of resource constraints. External funds are often provided to areas that suit the external partners more than the recipient countries; the quality of financial support and its effectiveness are rarely questioned. The transparency and accountability of external partners is also a critical governance concern. For one thing, LDCs face a global governance structure that is not favourable to them. In areas of trade, there are significant tariff and non-tariff barriers. The rules and tools of global governance are decided by richer countries. In global institutions, LDCs have neither adequate nor effective representation.[18]

[17] UNDP, "Challenges to Democracy," November 2004, pp. 5-6.

[18] These issues are addressed more extensively in Chapter Five.

# MDGs in LDCs: Modest progress, serious challenges and setbacks

*Despite the significant progress of some least developed countries in meeting specific goals, the progress of the least developed countries, as a group, in meeting most of the goals has been slow and uneven. Their progress has not been sufficient to achieve the goals of the Brussels Programme of Action and its objective of eradicating poverty and achieving sustained growth and sustainable development in the least developed countries. Moreover, it is projected that the number of people living in extreme poverty may increase from 334 million in 2000 to 471 million in 2015, if the current incidence of extreme poverty persists.*[19]

**There has been a substantial increase in women's representation in government.**

Despite great challenges and constraints, LDCs have recently made significant improvements in governance, human development and economic progress.

According to the Secretary-General's May 2005 report on the BPoA, most LDCs reported progress towards good governance, "in particular in efforts to promote democracy and human rights, introduce institutional reforms, fight corruption, empower people, especially women, and promote national reconciliation and dialogue." [20] Today, some degree of democracy exists in most LDCs.[21] In 2004 and 2005, more than a dozen elections at national or municipal levels took place in LDCs.[22] Of particular importance has been the advance, in most of them, in the processes of inclusion and representation through local elections.[23] In addition, there has been a substantial increase in women's representation in government. For example, the proportion of women in national parliaments in Mozambique and Rwanda increased from 16 percent and 17 percent, respectively, in 1990 to 34.8 percent and 48.8 percent in 2005 — a much higher figure than in many developed countries.[24] It should be noted that in November 2005, Liberian voters elected the first female Head of State in Africa.

In terms of human development, LDCs have also shown important progress in many indicators, including the following:

- Child mortality has been reduced by more than one-third — from 244 per 1,000 live births in 1970 to 157 per 1,000 live births in 2002.
- Adult literacy increased from 42 percent to 53 percent during 1990-2002. Seven out of every ten children reach grade 5 in 16 LDCs.

---

[19] United Nations, 2005, op cit, p. 19.

[20] Ibid., p. 5.

[21] See Nicolas Van de Walle, "Africa's Range of Regimes," *Journal of Democracy*, Vol. 13, No. 2, April 2002; Patrick Keuleers, "Governance in Least Developed Countries in Asia and Pacific: An Assessment of the Current Situation," UNDP, 2004, pp. 9-11; Michael Cowen and Liisa Laakso, eds., *Multi-party Elections in Africa*, Palgrave, 2002; Dieter Nohlen, Florian Grotz and Christof Hartmann, eds., *Elections in Asia and the Pacific: a Data Handbook*, Oxford University Press, 2001; Dieter Nohlen, Michael Krennerich and Bernhard Thibaut, eds., *Elections in Africa: a Data Handbook*, Oxford University Press, 1999; John Daniel, Roger Southall and Morris Szeftel, eds., *Voting for Democracy: Watershed Elections in Contemporary Anglophone Africa*, Ashgate, 1999.

[22] See Table 10 on governance indicators in the annex of this Report.

[23] Christine L. Fletcher, "Local Democracy: Electoral Systems and Representation in Asia and the Pacific," UNDP, 2005.

[24] UNDP, "Human Development Report 2005: International Cooperation at Crossroads: Aid, Trade, and Security in an Unequal World," 2005.

**Almost 43 percent of children under five are underweight for their age, making them far more susceptible to sickness related to one or more of five major diseases: pneumonia, diarrhea, malaria, measles and HIV/AIDS**

- During the last decade, LDCs experienced an annual per capita GDP growth rate of 1.5 percent.
- The debt-service ratio more than halved from 1990 to 2002 — from 16.2 percent to 7.7 percent, respectively.
- Per capita electricity consumption increased from 83 to 95 kilowatts during the last decade.
- Of 50 LDCs, 26 have ratified all the eight fundamental labour rights conventions. Twenty-three have signed and four have ratified the UN Convention against corruption, and 28 LDCs have signed and 15 have ratified the UN Convention against Transnational Organized Crime.
- Female youth literacy reached 57 percent in 2002, about 81 percent of the male rate. Female economic activity rate in LDCs was 64 percent in 2002, which was 74 percent of the male rate.

But all this progress must be put into perspective, as noted by the following:

- Achievements were not consistent among regions or countries. For example, debt-servicing as a proportion of exports declined by more than half — from 20 percent in 1999 to 7 percent in 2002 — for Asia-Pacific LDCs, a period during which it remained the same in countries like Burundi (at 65 percent).[25] Bangladesh was able to reduce its infant mortality between 1960 and 2003 by almost two-thirds, from 145 to 46 per 1,000 live births; in Zambia, however, the change was more modest over the same 43-year period — from 126 to 102 per 1,000 live births.[26]
- Even within countries, there were disparities in progress among different population groups. For example, in Cambodia the average infant mortality rate among the bottom quintile is 109.7 per 1,000 live births, double the rate of 50.3 per 1,000 live births among the top quintile.[27] In Chad and Yemen, the ratio of literacy of females to males is 31.4 percent and 41.1 percent, respectively.[28]
- Development outcomes in LDCs are lower than those of other developing countries. For example, the infant mortality rate in developing countries is 60 per 1,000 live births, significantly lower than that of 99 in LDCs.[29] Internet use in the developing world is about 53 per 1,000 people, compared with only 4 per 1,000 in LDCs.[30]

The Secretary-General's May 2005 report points out that despite economic growth, "the incidence of poverty in the least developed countries remained high, at about 43 percent."[31] Moreover, the report indicates that the proportion of people who suffer from hunger has decreased only slightly in the last decade, from 38 percent to 36 percent. Children are the most affected by malnutrition: In LDCs, almost 43 percent of children

[25] World Bank, "World Development Indicators 2005." Online: http://publications.worldbank.org/WDI/.

[26] UNICEF, "Statistical Information by Country 2005." Online: www.unicef.org/infobycountry/index.html.

[27] UNDP, "Human Development Report 2005: International Cooperation at Crossroads: Aid, Trade, and Security in an Unequal World," 2005, p 244.

[28] UNESCO Institute for Statistics 2005. Online: www.uis.unesco.org/ev.php?URL_ID=5187&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.

[29] UNDP, "Human Development Report 2005: International Cooperation at Crossroads: Aid, Trade, and Security in an Unequal World," 2005, p 253.

[30] Ibid., p. 265.

[31] United Nations, 2005, op cit, May 2005: p. 4.

[32] Ibid., pp. 7-8.

[33] UN-OHRLLS and UNDP, 2005, op cit, p. 1.

under five are underweight for their age, making them far more susceptible to sickness related to one or more of five major diseases: pneumonia, diarrhea, malaria, measles and HIV/AIDS.[32]

Overall, there have been serious setbacks and significant deprivations in development for LDCs. A case in point is the scourge of HIV/AIDS in sub-Saharan Africa. Due to the severity of the HIV/AIDS epidemic, life expectancy has plummeted to an alarming level over the past decade, reaching almost 39 years in some LDCs.[33] For example, Zambia has lost as much as 18 years in terms of life expectancy — from 50 years in 1970/1975 to 32 years in 2000/2005.

Among other dispiriting statistics, two in every five people in LDCs are not expected to survive to the age of 65. Nearly two of every five people are undernourished. The incidence of income poverty in LDCs is 43 percent, with more than 82 percent of rural households being income poor. One in every five children in LDCs is born with low weight. Three out of every five children in LDCs are not immunized. The maternal mortality ratio in LDCs is 890 per 100,000 live births (needless to say, such deprivations are unevenly distributed among regions, countries, socio-economic groups, gender and the rural-urban divide.)[34] The tsunami devastation at the end of 2004 had serious impacts on the housing and physical infrastructure of Maldives, one of the LDCs then being considered for graduation from LDC status.

## Messages in the chapters ahead

**Democratic governance expands the range of options for human development.**

The development indicators summarized above paint a mixed picture in most LDCs in terms of meeting the BPoA. As emphasized in the Secretary-General's May 2005 report and elsewhere, there is much work still to be done at the national and international levels to help improve the lives and well-being of people living in LDCs. Governance issues remain crucial elements of all strategies. This Report includes the following messages regarding how and why governance should be emphasized and reinforced.

- **Democratic governance expands the range of options for human development**. Chapter One provides an analytical framework on the relationship between human development and governance. The chapter analyzes this relationship in the specific context of LDCs and the achievement of the targets set in the Millennium Declaration and BPoA.
- **Capacity development efforts need to be oriented to create a public administration that embodies the core values of democratic governance (transparency, accountability, predictability, responsiveness and participation).** Chapter Two focuses on the notable challenges faced by LDCs in enhancing state capacity for sustainable human development and democratic governance. This chapter is grounded in the idea that state actors have a central and irreplaceable role in creating human development. It examines the difficulties in augmenting state capacity and promoting institutional change in LDCs and why it is so hard to achieve increased performance in these countries in support of the MDGs. The analysis focuses on key institutional mecha-

[34] UNDP, "Human Development Report 2004: Cultural Liberty in Today's Diverse World," 2004; United Nations, "Report of the Secretary-General: Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries for the Decade 2001-2010," 23 May 2005, A/60/91;E/2005/68. Online: www.un.org/special-rep/ohrlls/ldc/A-60-81_E-2005-68_E.pdf.

nisms at the national level to improve state institutions in both legitimacy and effectiveness in support of pro-poor development.

- **Dialogue and cooperation between state and non-state actors are essential for promoting development and democratic governance.** Chapter Three analyzes the ways in which non-state actors (civil society and the private sector, among others) are key stakeholders for sustainable development and democratic governance. This chapter also addresses the challenges and constraints of the non-state actors. It argues that the same principles of democratic governance should frame the actions of all stakeholders (state and non-state actors).
- **Governance and sustainable development require the existence of the rule of law, meaning that all persons and institutions, including state and non-state actors, are accountable to the laws that are publicly promulgated, equally enforced and independently adjudicated. The rule of law should be consistent with and informed by international human rights norms and standards.** Chapter Four highlights the importance of establishing and upholding the rule of law through sound legal systems that can promote democratic values and norms and protect and promote human rights. This chapter examines the range of capacity development approaches used to support legal and judicial reform and the embedding of human rights values and norms and questions. Moreover, this chapter argues that legal reforms should aim at broader developmental issues than economic growth and financial management systems, namely protecting human rights, increasing people's access to justice and resources, and promoting citizen's participation and inclusion.
- **Democratic governance in LDCs does not occur in isolation; it requires good global or international governance.** Chapter Five argues that LDCs face unfavourable rules and insufficient representation in the international arena. Nevertheless, it underlines that positive practices for generating favourable global governance for LDCs must come from South-South cooperation, including cooperation among LDCs, as well as from broader regional and international cooperation.

CHAPTER ONE

# Democratic governance for sustainable human development

# Introduction

Geopolitical changes in the post-Cold War era combined with globalization to set in motion major changes in all parts of the world. Governments and citizens alike began to question the consistency between domestic and foreign policy as internal stability and security surrounding people's everyday lives became more prominent. For people in the more developed countries, the global environment was becoming increasingly uncertain with the outsourcing of services and ongoing crises in corporate governance in many highly capitalized conglomerates. For both developing and developed countries, however, global efforts to influence social progress were mediated on the ground by popular support groups, politicians and trade unionists, and local business interests. Assessment of the effects of globalization brought changes in perspectives on trade and aid, and helped to re-orient the emphasis on a more political view of development. This prompted a search for relevant paradigms of development that would establish common ground in three interconnected areas: human rights, sustainable human development, and democratic governance. These issues became more central to international development as multilateral aid agencies themselves responded to calls for action that would support these three interdependent goals. Such responses were more visible than ever before as the media's reach and influence increased steadily, bringing news and information to an unprecedented number of households. All of these significant events coalesced at the turn of the 21st century, when governance dominated as the locus of change in the global development agenda.

**a framework must be pragmatic and flexible for it to remain relevant to the evolving realities of the 50 LDCs**

This chapter provides a conceptual framework for an analysis of democratic governance that is aligned with UN concepts of democracy, good governance, and development as a human right. As such, a development approach centred on human rights is one that incorporates equity with growth, among nations and for individual human beings. This Report adopts a working definition of democratic governance that LDCs could use in devising priorities for their national development and in considering negotiating positions in international forums. Hence, democratic governance is defined as a system of governance that incorporates into the notion of good governance, not only efficient processes, but also principles and institutions that secure the civic rights and freedoms of all people, including the poorest of the poor and marginalized groups. Furthermore, any idea of good governance that values human progress must logically satisfy one of two criteria. At the very least, it must not retard development, and at best should contribute to its advancement. As a conceptualization of democratic governance that is fundamentally normative, it aims to be coherent and generally acceptable. In addition, such a framework must be pragmatic and flexible for it to remain relevant to the evolving realities of the 50 LDCs.

This chapter examines how the three themes for democratic governance have evolved in the UN development doctrine, and have merged with UNDP views on human development and democratic governance. In particular it considers sustainable human development to be a legitimate paradigm suitable for the LDCs, which are structurally constrained by a triple set of vulnerabilities. With their fragile economies, these countries are disproportionately susceptible to, and affected by, external shocks. They also recover more slowly, which means they are less resilient as a group than other developing countries. Their ability to sustain themselves and grow is weakened by low human and material

capacities. This chapter also traces the adoption of human rights as the universal framework for development in UN declarations, which has the advantage of adding normative weight and coherence to the forms of democratic governance compatible with such a framework. The integration of sustainable human development with democratic governance creates a set of foundational principles that can form the basis for policy options in good governance to advance the implementation of the Brussels Programme of Action.

## The Brussels Programme of Action

LDCs were recognized as the most vulnerable group of developing countries in the late 1960s, when the International Development Strategy for the Second UN Development Decade highlighted special measures for them. A little more than a decade later, the first UN Conference on LDCs was held in Paris in 1981, resulting in the Substantial New Programme of Action. A second round of deliberations on issues specific to LDCs followed with the Second Conference on LDCs and resulted in the Paris Declaration and Programme of Action for the Decade, in 1990. However, the goals and objectives set for the decade were largely unattained.[35] The two graphs below (1.1 and 1.2) show both life expectancy and per capita GDP indicators remaining fairly steady from 1980 to 2000. Meanwhile, the number of LDCs rose from 24 to 50, with only one of its original members graduating from LDC status. The Committee for Development Policy confirmed at its fifth session, that Maldives and Cape Verde qualified for graduation from the list of LDCs according to its triennial review of 2003 and recommended their graduation (Committee for Development Policy Report on the Sixth Session, E/2004/33 p.iii).

**The BPoA therefore is seen as integral to the goals for poverty eradication articulated in the Millennium Development Declaration**

The Brussels Programme of Action (BPoA) 2001-2010, adopted in June 2001 at the Third UN Conference on LDCs, articulates policies and supportive actions to promote the long-term economic growth and sustainable human development of LDCs.[36] It seeks their successful integration into the global economy through partnerships that focus on developing the human and institutional resources needed to raise the quality of life for the 600 million people in the 50 LDCs. The BPoA therefore is seen as integral to the goals for poverty eradication articulated in the Millennium Development Declaration;[37] in fact, Goal 8 of the MDGs, to develop a global partnership for development, has direct relevance for democratic governance. The BPoA and MDGs carry particular significance for LDCs because their prospects for development are increasingly influenced by external events in which they have little say. The complementarity and synergy of efforts to support both programmes could well bring long-awaited changes to LDCs.

With respect to governance, the BPoA specifies the objectives, scope and arrangements for follow-up by national governments, and separately for their development part-

[35] General Assembly June 2001, "Programme of Action for the Less Developed Countries adopted by the Third Conference on LDCs in Brussels on 20 May 2001," A/conf/191/11, p. 3.

[36] Soon after adoption of the BPoA in May 2001, the United Nations General Assembly, by its resolution 55/279 of 12 July 2001, endorsed the Programme of Action, and the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), by its resolution 2001/320, decided to establish a follow-up mechanism for the review and coordination of the implementation of the Brussels Declaration and Programme of Action at its 2002 substantive session. See UN-OHRLLS, "Update on Programme of Action," April 2003, p. 2.

[37] According to UN-OHRLLS, the basic objective of the BPoA is to achieve, with respect to LDCs, substantial progress in meeting the MDGs of halving poverty by 2015 and promoting sustainable development. See UN-OHRLLS, "Update on Programme of Action," April 2003, p. 2.

ners. Its approach to development is consistent with those of the UN and UNDP in being comprehensive, coherent and looking far ahead into the future. The implications for national and global governance are underscored in the Programme's expectation of a wider sphere for dialogue that comes from aligning national policies and strategies in LDCs with the external assistance efforts of their partners. The BPoA identifies seven commitments, of which Commitment 2 (the second one listed below) is addressed specifically to governance:

- fostering a people-centred framework
- good governance at the national and international levels
- building human and institutional capacities
- building productive capacities to make globalization work for LDCs
- enhancing the role of trade and development
- reducing vulnerability and protecting the environment
- mobilizing financial resources

**Graph 1.1. Trends in GDP per capita for all LDCs, 1981-2004**

LDCs' GDP per capita PPP (constant 2000 US$) as share of the world

**Graph 1.2. Trends in life expectancy for all LDCs, 1980-2005**

LDCs' life expectancy as a share of the world

*Source: World Development Indicators (2005)*

## Functions of government

According to Arthur Lewis, one of the South's Nobel Prize-winning pioneers on economic development, the primary function of government is to maintain law and order. In sum, he argued, the political, economic and social categories of the functions of government, both internal and external, can be identified as follows:[38]

- maintaining public services (law and order, basic social services, protection of citizens, the making of treaties, defending its territories);
- influencing attitudes (to work, to the size of family, to inequality of income, to new techniques, to secularity and culture);
- shaping social and economic institutions (creating legislative and administrative frameworks, providing incentives for private entrepreneurship, and aligning traditional and customary roles and institutions with those in contemporary operation);
- influencing the use of resources (controlling land use; determining the location of industry and recreational facilities; estab-

[38] This formulation has been adapted from Arthur W. Lewis (1955), *The Theory of Economic Growth*, London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd, reprinted 2003: pp. 376-383.

lishing environmental standards for individual households, commerce and manufacturing; and controlling the exchange of goods and services);

- influencing the distribution of income (fair and equitable rewards according to differentiation of skills, administration of taxation, ensuring the well-being of all members of society);
- controlling the quantity of money and economic fluctuations (exercising discretionary control to stabilize the economy, reducing the effects of fluctuations of world trade on the internal economy); and
- ensuring full employment and influencing the level of investment (resolving the political and technical difficulties in capital formation, adding new resources, and making existing resources more usable).

## Elements of good governance

For development purposes, any definition of governance must relate government to the society as a whole, in terms of its quality and functions. Governance comprises the traditions, institutions and processes that determine how power is exercised, how citizens acquire a voice and how decisions are made on issues of public concern. The functions of government are not specific to a particular type of political regime, and good governance can be achieved in any number of ways in which government operates and exercises its functions. Therefore, while the basic functions of government are the same for economic growth or development, they operate differently in the distribution of output and the manner in which the output of society is assessed and measured.

From the viewpoint of UNDP, governance refers to "the exercise of economic, politi-

### Box 1.1. Core characteristics of good governance

- **Participation** — All men and women should have a voice in decision-making, either directly or through legitimate intermediate institutions that represent their interests. Such broad participation is built on freedom of association and speech, as well as capabilities to participate constructively.
- **Rule of law** — Legal frameworks should be fair and enforced impartially, particularly laws on human rights.
- **Transparency** — Transparency is built on the free flow of information. Processes, institutions and information are directly accessible to those concerned with them, and enough information is provided to understand and monitor them.
- **Responsiveness** — Institutions and processes try to serve all stakeholders.
- Consensus orientation — Good governance mediates differing interests to reach a broad consensus on what is in the best interest of the group, and where possible, on policies and procedures.
- **Equity** — All men and women have opportunities to improve or maintain their well-being.
- **Effectiveness and efficiency** — Processes and institutions produce results that meet needs while making the best use of resources.
- **Accountability** — Decision makers in government, the private sector and civil society organizations are accountable to the public, as well as to institutional stakeholders. This accountability differs depending on the organization and whether the decision is internal or external to an organization.
- **Strategic vision** — Leaders and the public have a broad and long-term perspective on good governance and human development, along with a sense of what is needed for such development. There is also an understanding of the historical, cultural and social complexities in which that perspective is grounded.

cal and administrative authority to manage a country's affairs at all levels. It comprises mechanisms, processes and institutions through which citizens and groups articulate their interests, exercise their legal rights, meet their obligations and mediate their differences."[39] Based on the accumulation of knowledge and information gained from its global experiences and networks, UNDP has compiled a set of elements that illuminate the understanding of good governance, as highlighted in Box 1.1.

## Democratizing good governance

The exercise of good governance may well result in economic growth and development, as the experiences of many developing countries can attest. However, this Report argues that for development to be sustained the ends and means of good governance should be "democratized."[40] For UNDP, the conceptualisation of development has been influenced by the work of another Nobel Prize-winning economist, Amartya Sen, whose ideas have been captured in some of the Human Development Reports since 1990. Democratizing good governance for human development means two things: 1) that the freedoms of development are ends in themselves, over and beyond their instrumental value, and 2) that freedom is the development metric by which people and governments monitor and assess human progress. For the Member States of the United Nations, this view of development links human rights to the pursuit of the objectives agreed upon by all countries (in the Millennium Declaration), and by LDCs in particular in the BPoA. Though there are ideological differences within and among countries as to what constitutes human rights, it is incontestable that human beings value not only their lives and livelihoods, but also the means and freedom to improve them. The ability to articulate those needs creates the basis of the social contract between those who govern and those who are governed. At the macro-social level, the relations of governance affect people's lives through the social relations with their families, with their communities and with society overall. Politics then, define the distribution of power among these structures internally as well in terms of international cooperation among nations.

**for development to be sustained the ends and means of good governance should be democratized...**

## The human rights framework for democratic governance

UN charters and resolutions have been interpreted as helping to provide a common framework of international norms and values that link human rights to development and democratic governance.[41] Human rights provide a constitutional framework for all countries to pursue sustainable development because it affords universally acceptable guide-

[39] UNDP, "Governance for Sustainable Human Development," Policy Paper, 1997. Online: http://magnet.undp.org/policy/chapter1.htm#b.

[40] The Ambassador and Permanent Representative of the United Republic of Tanzania to the United Nations H.E. Mr. Augustin Mahiga, speaking at a briefing on governance among LDCs Ambassadors jointly organized by UNDP and UN-OHRLLS, mentioned that "good governance is what makes democracy work by ensuring the institutions of representation, elections, independence of the judiciary, the rule of law and the respect for human rights." The briefing and consultation process was held on 26 September 2005.

[41] See Yash Ghai, "Human Rights and Social Development: Toward Democratisation and Social Justice." Democracy, Governance and Human Rights Programme Paper Number 5, UNRISD, 2001; Adel A. Abdellatif, "Good Governance and Its Relationship to Democracy and Economic Development," Global Forum III on Fighting Corruption and Safeguarding Integrity, Seoul, Republic of Korea, 20-31 May 2003.

lines that transcend national boundaries. The appeal to human rights is common ground for global governance systems that ensure the means to pursue development freedoms for individuals, groups and nations. The UN Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights offer a normative basis for accountability at varying levels of governance. The promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms formed part of the original purposes and principles of the UN, as formulated in Articles 1 and 2 of Chapter 1 in the Charter, which 50 countries signed on 26 June, 1945.

Human rights have attracted broad international support over the past several decades, and few governments publicly condemn their moral value. Human rights are of the highest importance for countries that did not exist before the creation of the UN in 1945; the act of independence per se was the result people exercising their rights. Thus, these nations (many of which are LDCs) can legitimately claim to have influenced today's human rights agenda in a fundamental way: by asserting the rights to self-determination, national identity, development and control over natural resources.

Well before the Millennium Development Summit in 2000, the importance of human rights for development was taken up by the Copenhagen Declaration on Social Development and Programme of Action in 1995. Many of the principles and goals enunciated in the Declaration also formed the central theme in the BPoA, including the commitment to "a political, economic, ethical, and spiritual vision for social development that is based on human dignity, human rights, equality, respect, peace, democracy, mutual responsibility and co-operation, and full respect for the various religious and cultural backgrounds of people" (para.25). At that time, governments agreed specifically to promote democracy (para.26(f)). They also undertook to "promote …all human rights (and fundamental freedoms for all), which are universal, indivisible, interdependent and interrelated, including the right to development….as an integral part of fundamental human development and fundamental freedoms for all, including the right to development" (paras. 26(j) and (i) and Commitment 1 (n)).

Ten years after the Copenhagen meeting, governments recommitted themselves to these same values, with a renewed focus on rule of law and democracy. As stated in the Outcome Document of the recently concluded Millennium Summit in New York (September 2005), "We recommit ourselves to actively protecting and promoting all human rights, the rule of law and democracy….and call upon all parts of the United Nations to promote human rights and fundamental freedoms in accordance with their mandates" (para 119, p. 28). While it is correct to note

## Box 1.2. General Assembly resolution promoting and consolidating democracy through good governance and sustainable development

- Promoting pluralism
- Promoting, protecting and respecting all human rights
- Strengthening the rule of law
- Developing, nurturing and maintaining an electoral system that provides for the free and fair expression of the people's will through genuine and periodic elections
- Creating and improving the legal framework and necessary mechanisms for enabling the participation of all members of civil society in the promotion and consolidation of democracy
- Strengthening democracy through good governance
- Strengthening democracy by promoting sustainable development
- Enhancing social cohesion and solidarity

*Source: UN Resolution adopted by the General Assembly A/RES.55/96 on "Promoting and Consolidating Democracy." February 2001*

that for the most part the international human rights movement has made more progress on paper than in practice, the Outcome Document shows evidence of an increasing awareness and willingness to emphasize democracy as part of a core strategy.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which was adopted and proclaimed by General Assembly resolution 217 A (III) of 10 December 1948, expressed the values of democracy in proclaiming that "the will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government" (article 21) and considered it essential that "human rights should be protected by the rule of law" (Preamble). Not long afterwards, the General Assembly adopted its first explicit resolution on "Promoting and Consolidating Democracy" to provide guidance for members (See Box 1.2[42]).

## Democratic governance: Good governance to promote human development

**Good governance is necessary but not sufficient for countries to sustain progress over the longer term.**

The earlier sections of this chapter identify the sources, origin and subsequent linkages in the UN concepts of democracy, good governance and sustainable development. The final building block is democratic governance, which received in-depth treatment in the UNDP Human Development Report 2002 (HDR 2002). (The report's theme was "deepening democracy in a fragmented world".) As noted in that report, people everywhere in the developing world hope that their government will pay closer attention to — and respond to — their living conditions. These expectations are equally strong in LDCs, where the poor people's prospects are more limited than in other developing countries. Good governance is necessary but not sufficient for countries to sustain progress over the longer term. There is a large body of research and studies that attempt to analyze the correlation of development and democracy, and several empirical studies examine the effects of democracy on economic growth.[43] However, there are far fewer studies that look at democratic governance from the viewpoint of human development, in which the individual person is a human being constitutive of abilities, disabilities and capabilities.[44]

The concept of democratic governance as used in this Report is people-centred — as reflected in the etymology of democracy, which literally means the *kratia* (power, rule, mastery) by the *demos* (people).[45] Democratic governance for human development embodies that most fundamental of democratic principles: that people should rule themselves through the government they freely choose. In countries where human development is a priority, governance has to be democratized for development outcomes to be sustained. This means that democratic governance incorporates into the notion of good governance, democratic principles, norms and institutions. Furthermore, democratic governance expands the range of options for human development. The predictability of principles enables economic agents to respond to incentives, and to make rational deci-

[42] UN Resolution adopted by the General Assembly A/RES.55/95 on "Promoting and Consolidating Democracy." 28th February 2001.

[43] See for example the Background Papers for the UNDP Human Development Report 2002, which contain references to key works.

[44] This is the fundamental notion in the Capability Approach, to which Sen's work has greatly contributed.

[45] See Richard Joseph, "Democracy in Africa after 1989: Comparative and Theoretical Perspectives," in Lisa Anderson (ed.) *Transitions to Democracy*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1999, Chapter 11. Joseph's essay examines the political changes around the reforms leading to more competitive and pluralist systems in over half of the 47 states in sub-Saharan Africa after the fall of the Berlin Wall.

sions. Mutual accountability among state and non-state actors promotes transparency and confidence for nation-building and enhances deliberative decision-making. Democratic governance seeks, in common with good governance, efficient institutions and a predictable economic and political environment that makes economic growth possible, and public services effective. However, moving beyond economic growth to human development requires political participation and economic freedom backed by a broader human rights platform. This is nowhere more evident than in the global governance arena, where the processes of and institutions for governing and being governed are far removed from the reality of the vast majority of people in LDCs.[46] There is a consensus, fed by perception but also by facts, among scholars and commentators, politicians and the general public on the democratic legitimacy of international organizations whose operations affect millions of people. These organizations are seen to exhibit a "democratic deficit" because they do too little to redress the fact that people in developing countries are largely excluded from engaging in the opportunities that globalization brings. International organizations cover large geographical domains, a situation that complicates democratic deliberation and decision. In addition, they lack institutions for either the direct or representative-driven interest group accountability that national systems provide. Questions of transparency, accountability and democratic participation have to be built into existing multilateral institutions. Such an agenda would aim towards building rules and institutions that are not only efficient but also equitable, and which are developed through a democratic process of giving people a voice to be heard and heeded.

The political history of developing countries that embarked on democratization in the "third wave" shows evidence of unevenness in gains.[47] Some countries remained or became ruled by authoritarianism, while others made sustained advances in political liberalization. All countries, however, configured their own paths to democracy by adapting

## Box 1.3. Democratic governance as good governance for sustainable human development

Democratic governance means that:

- people's human rights and fundamental freedoms are respected, allowing them to live with dignity;
- people have a say in decisions that affect their lives;
- people can hold decision makers accountable;
- inclusive and fair rules, institutions and practices govern social interactions;
- women are equal partners with men in private and public spheres of life and decision-making;
- people are free from discrimination based on race, ethnicity, class, gender or any other attribute;
- the needs of future generations are reflected in current policies;
- economic and social policies are responsive to people's needs and aspirations; and
- economic and social policies are aimed at eradicating poverty and expanding the choices that all people have in their lives.

*Source: "Human Development Report 2002," p. 51.*

[46] See Andrew Moravcsik, "Is there a 'Democratic Deficit' in World Politics? A Framework for Analysis" in *Government and Opposition*, April 2004, pp. 336-363.

[47] Samuel Huntington defined the third wave as the third major wave of modern democratization that began with Poland in 1974. See Samuel P. Huntington, The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century (Norman and London: University of Oklahoma Press, 1991).

variations to the classical models of democracy.[48] An influential viewpoint among political thinkers and observers is that all democracies are a combination of pure democracy and its antithesis, oligarchy. In its analysis of democratic governance in different social and cultural contexts, the HDR 2002 examines these ideas, among others, and put together a set of core elements that address the question: good governance for what? These core elements appear in Box 1.3. They go beyond a checklist of institutions, processes and principles to identify what needs to happen, and where people need to be, now and in future generations, if human development is to be sustained.

Many LDCs are further along the path to democratization to the extent that they are successful in putting in place a framework of institutions. For these, a central challenge for deepening democracy is building and strengthening the key institutions of democratic governance, as listed below:[49]

- a system of representation, with well-functioning political parties and interest associations;
- an electoral system that guarantees free and fair elections as well as universal suffrage;
- a system of checks and balances based on the separation of powers, with independent judicial and legislative branches;
- a vibrant civil society, able to monitor government and private business — and provide alternative forms of political participation;
- a free, independent media; and
- effective civilian control over the military and other security forces.

**a central challenge for deepening democracy is building and strengthening the key institutions of democratic governance...**

This list describes the variety of options for orienting a society towards democracy, in accordance with the historical conditions and circumstances of a particular LDC. As noted elsewhere in this Report, the experience of democratic governance in LDCs is often shaped by power shifts among different political parties. In these cases, the inherited structures of representation and the processes of accountability are adjusted according to the nature of citizens' participation and deliberative traditions. As Table 1.1 shows, in the majority of countries, models of representative democracy do exist, in which clear-cut conditions of accountability are an essential value. Within these systems, institutional arrangements for articulating the fundamental constructs of inclusion and participation are often in place, even if they are not always functional. In addition, advances in global communications have made it easier for information and knowledge on how societies function to cross borders worldwide. People in LDCs therefore are becoming more familiar with alternative forms of democratic systems.[50]

## Challenges in democratic governance for LDCs

All developing countries exhibit similar features of slow development that reflect a wide variety in levels of resources (human and material), types of institutions (economic,

[48] See John Gerring, Strom C. Thacker and Carola Moreno," A Centripetal Theory of Democratic Governance: A Global Inquiry," Paper resubmitted to the *American Political Science Review*, 13 March 2005. Online: http://smalln.spri.ucl.ac.be/GerringEtAl2005.pdf. The argument is that between decentralism and centralism, good democratic governance arises from institutions that successfully combine two goals: authority and inclusion, in a model of centripetalism.

[49] See UNDP, "Human Development Report 2002: Deepening Democracy in a Fragmented World," 2002.

[50] See Anders Hanberger, "Democratic Governance and Evaluation," a paper presented at the Sixth European Evaluation Society Conference in Berlin, 30 September – 2 October 2004. Hanberger focuses on the locus of power as distinguished in three models of democracy: representative, participatory, and deliberative.

political), social and cultural attitudes, and knowledge and innovation among other factors. The 50 countries that comprise the group of LDCs are further distinguished by the combination of geo-physical characteristics and resource endowment that exacerbate and compound their development efforts. They devote a large proportion of resources to strengthening their resilience to recover from natural disasters, and reducing their vulnerability to encroachment from man-made disasters. Countries of small size, for example, are constrained by the insufficient critical mass necessary to enable them to compete and engage on an international scale. Landlocked countries face questions of securing borders for instance, while other countries are severely resource-constrained. For these kinds of reasons people in the LDC group of countries often face extreme conditions of hardship, while the countries themselves are unable to have their views adequately represented in international forums where their development options are discussed. In sum then, LDCs face constraints on their capacities, in human and institutional terms, that reduce their control on matters that affect them, and often render them dependent on other countries to a large degree. What this means for global and national governance is that countries cannot manage effectively what they do not control, nor can they fulfil their part of the social contract. Individuals on the other hand, are unable to access the capabilities that would allow them to live their lives fully. Often people in LDCs are too pre-occupied with basic survival tasks, that they cannot make their voices heard and effect their rights and duties of the social contract. For LDCs as a whole then, different types of challenges occur in specific national and sub-national contexts.

**LDCs face constraints on their capacities, in human and institutional terms, that reduce their control on matter that affect them, and often render them dependent on other countries to a larger degree**

## Cultural relativism in constitutions

In the latter half of the 20th century, many countries in Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Arab States contemplated the task of drawing up constitutions, as a milestone in their post-colonial history. A large number were developing countries undergoing democratization, and a debate arose among political thinkers regarding the cultural relativity of democracy.[51] Many analysts of comparative constitutional government concluded that there were cultural limitations to the moral authority of liberal democracy, and calls emerged for a morally neutral conceptualisation. For example, Abdullahi Al-Na 'him, in an article titled "Religious Minorities under Islamic Law and the Limits of Cultural Relativism," [52] argued that "Islam cannot be totally discarded in the question of human rights because people understand things through their own culture." He concluded, however, that Muslims themselves "must seek ways to reconciling Shari'ah with fundamental human rights" because "no cultural relativism argument may be allowed to justify derogation from the basic obligation to uphold and protect the full human rights of religious minorities, within the Islamic or any other cultural context."

Constitutional government is a form of limited government based on a prescribed division of powers among public entities.[53] It is often defined by the rule of law as its leading principle, and this holds that no political authority is superior to the law of the

[51] Some researchers argue that the questions of cultural relativism, hierarchy of rights and defining new rights often lead to a dead end. See Marshall Conley and Daniel Livermore, "Human Rights, Development and Democracy: The Dilemmas of Linking Theory and Practice." Online: http://plato.acadiau.ca/COURSES/POLS/conley/pols4883/CONLIV.html.

[52] *Human Rights Quarterly 9*, February 1987, pp. 1-18.

[53] This paragraph is a re-formulation from Richard L. Sklar, "On the Study of Constitutional Government in Africa", in Okon Akiba, ed. *Constitutionalism and Society in Africa*, Ashgate, 2004.

land. Furthermore, people's rights are established by law, not by the arbitrary will of rulers, and these rights are protected by independent courts, in so far as the rule of law is observed. However, since neither democracy nor constitutional government is ever fully attained in practice, there is a tendency for political systems to be mixtures of democracy and its opposite, oligarchy. Accordingly, a major challenge for constitutional scholars and those whose task it is to interpret constitutions is how to identify forms and methods of government that both minimize the risk of authoritarianism and protect the rights of citizens. Many LDCs enter into crises that challenge the legitimacy of their constitutions, while others emerging from crises are confronted with the inherent difficulties of devising a new constitution. This Report is premised on the recognition that of different stages in political and governance processes in LDCs, and of the variety of democratic frameworks and institutions that are in place. Table 1.1 illustrates the variety of electoral systems in the constitutions of the 50 LDCs.

In the preparation of this Report, individuals from various political and academic spheres in countries were consulted, including those currently active in policy-making in LDCs and developing countries. The comments and views expressed indicated that issues regarding culturally sensitive aspects of democracy remain relevant and ongoing. The prevailing conclusion was that a great need remained for increasing cross-cultural dialogue to adequately and properly conceptualize and understand what is meant by democracy for LDCs in the contemporary world. The conceptualization of liberal democracy as the UN model for democratic governance is formulated as a normative ideal, against which nations can assess their progress. As such, the concepts take shape and become realizable only through practice and dialogue. This process imparts the cultural context for development to be sustainable, and ensures that democracy and development move in the same positive direction.

**a great need remained for increasing cross-cultural dialogue to adequately and properly conceptualized and understand what is meant by democracy for the LDCs...**

## Post-conflict democracy

Those LDCs emerging from conflict situations face the immediate task of establishing law and order in the shortest time possible. They therefore have to give thought to the electoral and procedural elements that would help direct people's energies to consolidating peace. There is a danger however, that the longer-term requirements for development will become over-shadowed by the urgent need to establish a minimum functioning society. In this situation, some analysts have suggested models of democracy that emphasized the community aspects of opinion-forming and decision-making traditional to many LDCs. Others have emphasized the consensual nature of politics that prevail in more stable countries across Africa and Asia. In these situations, power-sharing offers a viable means for negotiating a post-conflict agreement, under conditions of high uncertainty about the country's future. For these countries, the risk of applying majoritarian rules is that one faction of the political spectrum may attempt to usurp power and exclude rivals in the longer-term. While in theory, power-sharing will reduce the tendency for a swing to oligarchy, in practice it has proved more difficult for the society as a whole to develop the levels of trust in one another that would be needed in power-sharing environments. Nonetheless, it remains an option that can be considered and retained while the supporting social institutions are being strengthened.[54]

[53] This paragraph is a re-formulation from Richard L. SKlar, "On the Study of Constitutional Government in Africa", in Okon Akiba, ed. *Constitutionalism and Society in Africa*, Ashgate, 2004.

## Gender in democratic governance

The mobilizing power of women in those LDCs that have moved towards greater political liberalization has been well recorded in the literature. In addition, international donors have increasingly sought out women's groups as valuable resources in the efforts to combat the spread of HIV/AIDS, in the re-integration of combatants, in the caring of war (or HIV/AIDS) orphans and the economy and in programmes for income-generation. Far less attention is given to women's participation in political life, or in formal politics. As more women enter the political arena, changes in women's voting behaviour, their presence in national parliaments, and their active role in civil society undoubtedly affects the democratization process. Women's political participation affects, and is shaped by democratization, and while this is not in itself a new finding, or one that is specific to developing countries, gender analysis can contribute to the understanding of comparative political systems.[55] The experiences gained could enhance the sharing of knowledge for LDCs, which are smaller in number compared to the rest of the countries in the developing world. One area of research that is gaining ground is the use of gender quotas to promote women's participation in electoral politics. As with all quota-based formulas for distributing resources, and correcting imbalances in decision-making, the success of proposals depends on the country's willingness to have women in places where they can make a real difference. There is also a need to ensure that the proposals and reforms for increasing women's participation are protected by laws that would effectively redress the imbalances over the long term.

**There is a need to ensure that the proposals and reforms for increasing women's participation are protected by laws that would effectively redress the imbalances over the long term.**

## Assessing governance

Measuring the quality of various aspects of governance is not central to this Report. Nonetheless, evaluation is a valid objective in the comparative analysis of political systems, and numerous attempts have been made to construct and use indicators of governance. International aid agencies use specific instruments of measurement for analytical, monitoring and evaluation purposes in preparing their reports on country strategies.[56] To a large extent, this is a reflection of the influence of the debate on "new institutionalism." This term refers to the role of institutions in shaping development outcomes, and underlies the themes in global partnerships that call for improvements in governance in both public and corporate institutions.[57] As pointed out earlier in this chapter, the economies and societies of LDCs are more susceptible to external shocks than other countries, given their frequently unfavourable geographic factors and levels of development. Furthermore, their vulnerable characteristics indicate a need for these countries to be particularly alert to the regional and global initiatives that concern their development,

[54] For a review of the issues, See Pippa Norris, "Stable Democracy and Good Governance in Divided Societies: Do Power-Sharing Institutions Work?," Faculty Research Working Paper Series, Harvard University, John F. Kennedy School of Government, RWP05 -014, February 2005.

[55] See Jane S. Jaquette, "Regional Differences and Contrasting Views", *Journal of Democracy*, Vol. 12, No. 3, 2001, pp. 111-125.

[56] For a comprehensive set of governance indicators, see for example: Abdul Malik, "State of Art in Governance Indicators," Background Paper for the UNDP Human Development Report 2002; Kaufmann, D., A. Kraay and M. Mastruzzi, *Governance Matters IV: Governance Indicators for 1996-2004*, Vols. 1 and 2, 2005; OECD DAC Evaluation of Development Programmes – Governance and Capacity Development, online: www.oecd.org/department.

[57] For example, the Blair Commission for Africa, the UNDP Human Development Report 2005 and the UN Millennium Summit 2005 all emphasized the idea of mutual accountability in global governance.

and to ensure that their own perspectives are taken into account. Many LDCs have expressed their concerns regarding the standards used for measuring governance, and these concerns have become increasingly relevant to the self-assessment approaches taken by regional groupings.[58]

### Financing peace and post-conflict reconstruction

For LDCs that have experienced civil war, liberation struggles, border clashes or other forms of violent disruptions, the scale of human disaster far outweighs the economic costs. The greatest number of casualties almost always includes women, children and weaker members of society. The majority of these hostilities are internal to the country and are often localized in particular areas of ethnic, religious or cultural strife. This observation has led to the suggestion that increased effort to understand the root causes of wars, and a better appreciation of the sensitivities of those who are involved, may help identify lasting solutions. In countries in conflict, there are significant variations in the causes of war as well as the outcomes. Even though all such countries experience some measure of state disintegration, the extent of collapse in capacities does vary. Perhaps more importantly for the future of these countries, each has a different level and kind of resources that can be utilized in post-conflict tasks.

**The absence of a clear financial framework for peace-building efforts compound the challenges of rebuilding a functioning state in these situations**

Despite an intensification (since the end of the Cold War) in the international community's willingness to intervene in these conflicts, not much is known about the impact of economic assistance on the success of peace-building.[59] For LDCs in particular, there is even less data available to build programmes that match resources with needs, since these countries would not have had strong data-monitoring capacities to begin with. The absence of a clear financial framework for peace-building efforts compounds the challenges of rebuilding a functioning State in these situations. Any planned transition to democratic governance under these fragile circumstances must begin with re-establishing the security of lives and livelihoods. To date, external assistance from international and regional organizations has tended to involve multiple sources of financial and material resources, and programmes of short-term duration. There is a growing body of research, complemented by pilot initiatives, on the potential benefits of decentralized funding arrangements in post-conflict areas. The United Nations Capital Development Fund (UNCDF) is active in 37 of the 50 LDCs, with programmes designed to restore financial sectors in post-disaster situations through microfinance.[60] Other programmes support decentralized public investments through participatory and inclusive planning and resource management in local governance arenas.

LDCs in Asia, Latin America and Africa have increasingly turned to regional organizations for assistance in reconstruction and recovery. Organizations such as the

[58] The NEPAD African Peer Review Mechanism is one such approach that has become operational, and more countries are electing to undertake reviews of their governance institutions' performance.

[59] See Susan L. Woodward, "Local Governance Approach to Social Re-integration and Economic Recovery in Post-Conflict Countries: The Political Context for Programs of UNDP/UNCDF Assistance," Discussion Paper for the Workshop "A Local Governance Approach to Post-Conflict Recovery", 8 October 2002, New York, organized by the Institute of Public Affairs, jointly hosted by UNCDF and BCPR.

[60] The UN General Assembly, which designated 2005 as the International Year of Microcredit, held a Microfinance Summit in New York in September 2005. The Summit recognized the successful efforts of the private sector, media, civil society, and governments in raising the profile of microcredit as a tried-and-tested means of improving lives of poor people.

Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) and its regional forum (ARF), the Organization of American States (OAS), and the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) are striving to boost their capacity to respond to emergencies, disasters and violent strife in by continuously appealing to members for meaningful cooperation. For example, the NEPAD Secretariat has put together a concerted framework, with the support of its various member States, that presents an African agenda for dealing with the issues of post-conflict reconstruction. The framework attempts to form a nexus in the peace, security, humanitarian and development dimensions of post-conflict reconstruction and peace-building.[61] The idea is to try to achieve consistency in the policies and programmes of regional economic commissions, the African Union (AU) and member States — and to align these with the agendas of the international agencies and private contractors that comprise the external sector. Similarly, participants at the 12th meeting of the ASEAN regional forum, held in July 2005, reaffirmed the importance of ARF as the main multilateral political and security forum in the region and agreed to its further strengthening. In general, ministers agreed to continue to observe the basic principles of decision-making by consensus and non-interference. They also welcomed the idea of stand-by arrangements for disaster relief under the auspices of the United Nations, including rehabilitation and reconstruction efforts in the medium and long terms. Under the ASEAN Agreement on Disaster Management and Emergency Response, meeting participants hope to ensure the speedy establishment of regional mechanisms on disaster reduction, including preparedness and mitigation. The AU's theme of self-support was also echoed by the ARF countries when they noted the efforts of affected countries, as national coordinators, to ensure an effective channeling and utilization of assistance in reconstruction efforts.[62]

**There is a strong call from LDCs themselves to make political leadership a top priority**

Increased regional support for peace-building and reconstruction is likely to bolster the prospects of LDCs whose resource bases have been systematically eroded through wars and disasters. There is a strong call from LDCs themselves, as well as from their neighbours in the region, former Heads of State and civilian groups, to make political leadership a top priority in efforts to reverse the negative trends in human development across the sub-continents.[63] Engaged and positive leadership is a first step towards building support from people in need of hope and confidence in the wake of conflicts. For them, the democratization of the means of governance, through electoral procedures and political reform, must be followed by the democratization of the ends of governance. People expect that their participation in the rebuilding of human capacities will benefit future generations, and they anticipate the opportunities for incentives to create lasting peace in their own communities as well as on a larger scale.

### Financing institutions of democratic governance

As the OAS notes, democracy means more than holding elections.[64] Democratic governance must also deliver in the economic and social spheres, such as in the provision of

[61] NEPAD Secretariat, "The African Post-Conflict Reconstruction Policy Framework", Governance, Peace and Security Program, June 2005,.

[62] Chairman's Statement, The Twelfth Meeting of the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF), Vientiane, 29 July 2005.

[63] This observation was made by several participants at the Ambassadors' Consultation Meeting, convened on 26 September 2005 by BDP/UN-OHRLLS, to discuss the challenges of governance in LDCs

[64] See the text of the OAS Inter-American Democratic Charter online at www.oas.org.

**Table 1.1: Electoral systems in LDCs**

| Country | Electoral system for national legislature | Type | Tiers | Legislature size (directly elected, voting members) | Electoral system for president |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Afghanistan | SNTV | Mixed | 1 | 500 | Two-round system |
| Angola | List proportional representation | PR | 2 | 220 (220) | Two-round system |
| Bangladesh | First past the post | P/m | 1 | 300 (300) | - |
| Benin | List PR | PR | 1 | 83 (83) | Two-round system |
| Bhutan | N | - | | - | - |
| Burkina Faso | List PR | PR | 2 | 111 (111) | Two-round system |
| Burundi | List PR | PR | 1 | 81 (179) | - |
| Cambodia | List PR | PR | 1 | -, (123) | - |
| Cape Verde | List PR | PR | 1 | 72 (72) | Two-round system |
| Central African Republic | Two-round system | P/m | 1 | 105 (105) | Two-round system |
| Chad | Party bloc vote | P/m | | - , (155) | Two-round system |
| Comoros | Two-round system | P/m | 1 | 18 (33) | First past the post |
| Democratic Republic of the Congo | First past the post/ List PR | Mixed | | Mixed | Two-round system |
| Djibouti | Party bloc vote | P/m | 1 | 65 (65) | Two-round system |
| Timor-Leste | Parallel systems | Mixed | 2 | 88 (88) | Two-round system |
| Equatorial Guinea | List PR | PR | 1 | 100 (100) | First past the post |
| Eritrea | N | - | | - | - |
| Ethiopia | First past the post | P/m | 1 | - , (547) | - |
| Gambia | First past the post | P/m | 1 | 48 (53) | Two-round system |
| Guinea | Parallel systems | Mixed | 2 | 114 (114) | Two-round system |
| Guinea-Bissau | List proportional representation | PR | 1 | 102 (102) | Two-round system |
| Haiti | Two-round system | P/m | 1 | 83 (83) | Two-round system |
| Kiribati | Two-round system | P/m | 1 | 40 (42) | Two-round system |
| Lao PDR | Bloc vote | P/m | 1 | 109 (109) | - |
| Lesotho | Mixed member proportional system | Mixed | 2 | 120 (120) | - |
| Liberia | First past the post | - | | - | Two-round system |

| Country | Electoral system for national legislature | Type | Tiers | Legislature size (directly elected, voting members) | Electoral system for president |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Madagascar | First past the post | P/m | | - , (160) | Two-round system |
| Malawi | First past the post | P/m | 1 | 193 (193) | First past the post |
| Maldives | Bloc vote | P/m | 1 | 42 (50) | Indirectly elected |
| Mali | Two-round system | P/m | 1 | - , (147) | Two-round system |
| Mauritania | Two-round system | P/m | 1 | - , (81) | Two-round system |
| Mozambique | List proportional representation | PR | 1 | 250 (250) | Two-round system |
| Myanmar | First past the post | P/m | 1 | 485 (485) | - |
| Nepal | First past the post | P/m | 1 | 205 (205) | - |
| Niger | List proportional representation | PR | | 83 (83) | Two-round system |
| Rwanda | List PR | PR | 1 | 53 (80) | First past the post |
| Samoa | First past the post | P/m | | 49 (49) | - |
| São Tomé and Principe | List PR | PR | 1 | 55 (55) | Two-round system |
| Senegal | Parallel systems | Mixed | 2 | 120 (120) | Two-round system |
| Sierra Leone | List PR | PR | 1 | 112 (124) | Two-round system |
| Solomon Islands | First past the post | P/m | 1 | 50 (50) | - |
| Somalia | N | - | | - | - |
| Sudan | First past the post | P/m | 1 | 270 (360) | Two-round system |
| Togo | Two-round system | P/m | 1 | 81 (81) | Two-round system |
| Tuvalu | Bloc vote | P/m | 1 | 15 (15) | - |
| Uganda | First past the post | P/m | 1 | 214 (295) | Two-round system |
| United Republic of Tanzania | First past the post | P/m | 1 | 231 (295) | Two-round system |
| Vanuatu | SNTV | Other | 1 | 52 (52) | - |
| Yemen | First past the post | P/m | 1 | 301 (301) | Two-round system |
| Zambia | First past the post | P/m | 1 | 150 (158) | First past the post |

Note: PR - proportional representation; SNTV - single non-transferable vote; N - no system for direct elections; P/m - Plurality/majority.

*Sources: ESD (Electoral System Design); Electoral Systems at the ACE Project; International IDEA as of January 2005; IDEA February 2006; media releases March 2006..*

public goods, and ensure conditions in which people can continuously participate in the democratic process and influence policy between elections. In some countries, the constitution provides the mechanisms for accountability by the State's representatives, on matters of public finance. Under these circumstances, the people, through the officials they elect to public office, are informed of the fiscal decisions that relate to their lives. However, in the vast majority of LDCs, there is insufficient opportunity for transparency in the management of public funds, which increases the tendency for corruption in the use of these funds by public officials. In addition, mechanisms for holding these officials accountable for criminal charges are often non-existent, and the lack of impunity erodes the social trust and public confidence that underpin democratic governance.

The balance of power and authority at all levels of society that enhances good governance also provides the checks and limits on discretionary power that are inherent in institutions of democratic governance. In any given national setting, the legislative, executive and judicial arms of government have to be adequately funded to carry out their duties of ensuring people's equitable access to justice and national security. There is less likelihood for discontent among the diverse groups in society when the planning and management of public resources are open to scrutiny, thus allowing decisions made by the authorities to be challenged and discussed. At sub-national levels, decentralization of decision-making and responsibility can help alleviate pressure on central authorities seeking to adequately distribute limited financial resources and services in remote areas or among heterogeneous group. However, not all local-level situations are amenable to local administration of resources, which is why each country must consider models of decentralized governance that best suit its circumstances. In the final analysis, what is important for sustained development is for the balance between means and ends — in approaches to problem-solving or in the collective raising of resources — to be maintained across all levels of society, and with those on the outside.

CHAPTER TWO

# State capacity

# Introduction

The need for a capable State is recognized in the UN Millennium Declaration of 2000. In support of this global compact, the UN General Assembly in Resolution 57/277 (December 2002) asserted that "efficient, accountable, effective and transparent public administration, at both the national and international levels, has a key role to play in the implementation of internationally agreed goals, including those contained in the United Nations Millennium Declaration." This resolution reinforced Commitment 3 of the BPoA, which reaffirmed that "building human and institutional capacity" to establish a capable State is imperative in the efforts to meet the MDGs — and thereby eradicate poverty and improve the lives of people living in LDCs.[65]

In LDCs, as in developing countries in general, the State plays a central role in addressing development challenges. From a human rights perspective, which is concerned with the obligations of the State as bearers of duties towards its citizens, the existence of state capacity for human rights protection and the delivery of basic services is critically important.[66] As might be expected, States have varying degrees of capability to fulfil their duties and deliver on their obligations towards protecting human rights. A lack of state capacity is not an excuse to absolve States of their duties towards the protection of human rights, however. Instead, recognition of this lack serves as an important entry point for considering the kinds of interventions that are necessary to strengthen democratic governance and, ultimately, to advance achievement of the MDGs, which in turn will promote people's right to development and other human rights.

**the challenges to state capacity in LDCs are not only different in degree, but are qualitatively different from the challenges faced by governments in other countries**

First, this chapter begins with a brief discussion of the concept of state capacity. It also looks at how state capacity, or the absence of it, requires different approaches depending on national context, and provides an example of a typology of LDCs from the perspective of their capacity needs. Second, the chapter provides a short summary of the evolution of public administration reform over the last two decades or so, and how this has affected LDCs in particular. Third, the chapter examines state capacity from the perspective of three broad areas where state capacity is harnessed in aid of development: governance, economic management and fostering human development. Discussed extensively in this section is corruption, which has a uniquely corrosive effect on state capacity (and on governance more generally) in LDCs as elsewhere. Finally, the chapter considers the challenges faced by many LDCs and the role of state capacity in addressing them. The two key underlying premises of this chapter are 1) the challenges to state capacity in LDCs are not only different in degree, but are qualitatively different from the challenges faced by governments in other countries, and 2) state capacity is the outcome of a long-term process, driven by the demand and participation of many stakeholders and supported by legitimate democratic institutions, effective controls, checks and balances on the use of resources, the acceptable limits of power, and the accessibility to and protection of liberty and justice.

[65] Declaration and Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries for the Decade 2001–2010.

[66] The State's role in guaranteeing human rights is predicated on its obligations to citizens. The Human Development Report 2000 on Human Rights discussed the notion of "imperfect obligations" for delivery on human rights given the varying degrees of capacity as well as the overlapping obligations of duty-bearers (including the State). Importantly, the idea of imperfect obligation is twinned with the notion of the "progressive realization" of human rights; this indicates that despite varying degrees of competencies and overlapping obligations, the State is the primary duty-bearer for the protection and promotion of human rights.

# State capacity and the context for capacity development in LDCs

"Capacity" as it is understood in this Report is a dynamic concept, referring to "the ability of people, institutions and societies to perform functions, solve problems, and set and achieve objectives."[67] Capacity is rarely addressed in isolation; it needs to be considered within the web of complex relationships that characterize the institutional environments in which the State operates. Capacity thus cannot be built by merely adding components of hardware, people or knowledge. Instead, it requires the establishment of a positive dynamic that enables people to engage in an informed and empowered way with functioning institutions and processes, to achieve desired outcomes.[68] One of the important components of this dynamic is to ensure that institutions and processes facilitate greater accountability, participation and transparency for people to take an active part in the decisions that affect their lives. To that end, it is important to recognize three essential characteristics of capacity development:[69]

- local capacities always exist, however weakened they may be even in situations of conflict, and they should be the starting point for capacity development work;
- unleashing capacities goes hand in hand with political leadership that is empowering and provides space to both state and non-state actors; and
- both governments and external partners need to recognize capacity development as both a process and goal of development. It contributes not only institutional efficiency for delivering on development, but also shapes the direction and content of development policies.

**unleashing capacities goes hand in hand with political leadership that is empowering and provides space to both state and non-state actors**

The success of the State in providing access to basic social services and protecting and promoting a life of dignity rests in its ability to provide stable and enabling institutions. Institutions comprise a wide range of types, including political systems and public and private organizations, which are created and evolve in association with social norms and local culture. For institutions to be successful, they must be both legitimate in the eyes of the citizens and effective and efficient in their ability to undertake the development agenda and governance functions. These criteria entail two distinct components. The first concerns the attributes and characteristics of state institutions that make them legitimate, and the second refers to the capability and efficiency of these institutions to perform certain functions that make them effective. But while research suggests a positive correlation between the quality and performance of state institutions and development outcomes,[70] there is still limited information on the determinants of institutional change

[67] Lopes, Carlos and Thomas Theisohn, *Ownership, Leadership and Transformation: Can We Do Better for Capacity Development?*, New York: Earthscan Publications Ltd/UNDP, 2003, p. 1.

[68] UNDP and Christian Michelsen Institute, "Unleashing Capacities to Achieve the MDGs: Summary Note." Bergen Seminar Series, 2005. Online: www.capacity.undp.org/IndexAction.cfm?module=Library&action=GetFile&DocumentID=5384.

[69] See Lopes, Carlos and Thomas Theisohn, *Ownership, Leadership and Transformation. Can We Do Better for Capacity Development?*, New York: Earthscan Publications Ltd/UNDP, 2003; Stephen Browne, ed., *Developing Capacity through Technical Cooperation: Country Experiences*, New York: Earthscan Publications Ltd/UNDP, 2002; World Bank, *Enabling Country Capacity to Achieve Results: 2005 CDF Progress Report*, Washington: World Bank, 2005.

[70] Not all observers agree that institutions are the dominant factor. Jeffrey Sachs considers geography to be the most important factor that explains differences in growth rates. See Jeffrey Sachs, "Institutions Don't Rule: Direct Effects of Geography on Per Capita Income," *NBER Working Paper*, No. w 9490, 2003.

that support political stability and on policy options to induce institutional innovations in low-income countries.[71]

An effective, transparent and accountable civil service is one basic requirement for establishing legitimate institutions and ensuring necessary development services. Public administration reform is crucial to developing the kind of civil service that embodies the core values of democratic governance in its functions. Moreover, appropriate systems of decentralized and local governance are also critical for the provision of effective and responsive social services at the local level. Increasingly important is the State's capacity to encourage creative service delivery methods that involve the private sector and civil society organizations. Common to all these is the need for efficiency in resource use.

**appropriate systems of decentralized and local governance are also critical for the provision of effective and responsive social services at the local level**

Identifying appropriate interventions to support and build state capacity in LDCs requires an assessment of their current realities, as well as an understanding of the overall context within which these realities evolved. Historically, most LDCs emerged as sovereign nations by overcoming colonial rule and establishing themselves as modern States.[72] Many of them inherited legacies of severe institutional deficits, which continue to exercise distorting influences, and arbitrarily drawn territorial borders that did not take into account ethnic, cultural or geographic factors. Even with these liabilities, many LDCs have made moves towards greater democratization over time — such as reforming their formal institutions to become more responsive, accountable and transparent so that civic life more open, informed and participatory.

### Necessary attributes of state institutions

Effective state institutions encompass certain attributes and characteristics that persuade citizens to support them and view them as legitimate and competent. These characteristics include:

- effective institutional design upholding democratic principles such as the separation of powers, a system of checks and balances, independence of the judiciary, and civilian control over the armed forces;
- predictability in performance — i.e., the ability of institutions to undertake regular tasks of reproducing legitimacy through consultations with the population (e.g., elections) and ensuring fair contestation over political power. This is a critical element in promoting democratic, peaceful and rule-bound change in political leadership;[73]
- responsiveness and adaptability, e.g., the ability to respond and adjust successfully to changing political, social and economic environments through sound flexible policies; and
- sustainability and self-reliance, e.g., the ability to raise resources and revenues to keep state institutions running and ensure their absorptive capacity.

An effective civil service is at the heart of ensuring necessary development services.

[71] The International Monetary Fund (IMF) admits that there is still little understanding of what specific institutional setting will work best in a specific local context. See *World Economic Outlook: Growth and Institutions*, Washington, DC, IMF, 2003.

[72] Mick Moore, "Political Underdevelopment: What Causes Bad Governance" in *Public Management Review*, Vol. 3, Issue 3, 2001.

[73] Predictability, a key attribute of state capacity, is closely related to "rule of law" in the sense of regulating interactions and setting disputes in an impartial manner.

### Main developmental functions of state institutions

In the traditional view of public administration, state capacity has been addressed as an internal issue that is closely linked to political authority itself. From a governance perspective, public administration is seen as a much more open system, subject to the principles of good governance (transparency, accountability, responsiveness, participation, non-discrimination, efficiency and effectiveness). These principles are now becoming the core values against which the performance of the public sector is measured. Institutions that perform in accordance with such an established value system enhance their legitimacy and effectiveness.[74]

Essential developmental and governance functions include:

- provision of security and the protection of rights;
- provision of key basic services that cannot be left to market forces alone to provide. Such services may, for instance, require uniform territorial coverage or entail sizeable investments for medium- to long-term returns;
- regulatory functions including the formulation, implementation and enforcement of laws and regulations; and
- performing certain redistributive functions for improving social justice, e.g., furthering gender equality and redressing regional and sectoral imbalances.

The strengths and weaknesses of state capacity can be considered from three perspectives: the State's capacity to respond to governance challenges; to address the economic challenges faced by LDCs; and to address the human development challenges.

**From a governance perspective, public administration is seen as a much more open system, subject to the principles of good governance...**

## Recent trends in public administration reform in LDCs

Public administration reforms undertaken in LDCs in the 1980s were generally donor-driven initiatives that targeted the internal machinery of government, financial management and civil service reforms. These attempts to rationalize public administration were usually imposed on LDCs as part of structural adjustment programmes (SAPs) formulated by international financing institutions. Most initiatives sought to address problems of over-expansion, growing public debt and declining budget revenues by, for instance, introducing reforms aimed to reduce public-sector spending, mainly by reducing the size of the civil service and limiting the wage bill, and by privatizing the economic sectors. The emphasis on macroeconomic reforms and the consequent reduction of public expenditures resulted, however, in a decline in the scope and effectiveness of the State. Most of these reforms were unsuccessful even in achieiving the limited objectves of fiscal stability.

This model for wide-ranging reform programmes in both developed and developing states, known collectively as new public management (NPM), stemmed largely from the influence of a number of countries — notably Anglo-Saxon nations such as Australia, Canada, the United Kingdom and the United States.[75] NPM sought to roll back the role of the State by applying private-sector management principles to government agencies. According to an analysis of this model, "The characteristic tools of NPM are competi-

[74] For example, in Botswana, the model former LDC, public administration reforms initiated since the 1970s were part of a clearly formulated vision of change, with strong citizen participation in the formulation and implementation of public policies.

[75] UNDP, *UNDP Practice Note: Public Administration Reform*, New York, 2004.

tion, marketization, autonomization, disaggregation and deregulation, all of which embody an anti-bureaucratic philosophy. The fundamental criticism of bureaucracy in this view is that it has no answer to efficiency except more rules and regulations, the usual result of which is greater inefficiency."[76] The 1990s saw an enthusiastic dissemination of this model to developing countries; not surprisingly, these reforms have been more successful in countries whose administrative traditions derive from Anglo-Saxon models. However, even in relatively successful developing countries, the success of reforms was hampered by NPM's assumption that a professionalized and effective public administration was in place from the very beginning — something that usually did not exist in developing countries. Nevertheless, the language of NPM — and the principles of client focus, decentralization, separation of policy-making from implementation and the use of private partners for service delivery — continues to inform current thinking about public administration reform.

**this emerging model also call for new forms of skills and leadership on the part of civil servants, including a greater emphasis on political impartiality and social responsibility**

The evolving understanding of development emerging in the 1990s included greater attention to "governance," a concept that entered common usage in that decade. As noted throughout this Report, the term has been defined by UNDP as the exercise of political, economic and administrative authority to manage a country's affairs.[77] More recently, observers have noted the emergence of a possible new paradigm for public administration, captured by the term "responsive governance" in the latest United Nations World Public Sector Report.[78] According to that report, "An important objective of governing institutions is to promote constructive interaction between the State, the private sector and civil society. Later, in World Bank and donor discourse, it became a call to arms for advancing a new agenda of development assistance, the perception being that financial or technical assistance would not be put to good use until such concepts as transparency and accountability, due process, probity and efficiency were institutionalized in the systems of government of recipient countries." The responsive governance model focuses more on incorporating and including citizens in all their stakeholder roles, and relies less on direct provision and heavy doses of government authority. It displays a preference for self-regulation and partnerships with non-governmental institutions.

The openness and transparency that are part of this emerging model also call for new forms of skills and leadership on the part of civil servants, including a greater emphasis on political impartiality and social responsibility. The emerging importance of information and communication technologies (ICTs) for public administration has also played an important role in fostering new approaches, which make possible a more dispersed but at the same time more informed and transparent process of decision-making; better coordination of service delivery; and easier communication between citizens and the

[76] United Nations, *World Public Sector Report 2005: Unlocking the Human Potential for Public Sector Performance*, ST/ESA/PAD/SER.E/63, New York, United Nations, 2005. Online: http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/un/unpan021616.pdf.

[77] UNDP, *Public Sector Management, Governance, and Sustainable Human Development*, New York, UNDP, 1995, p. 18

[78] The term "responsive governance" and the description of the new paradigm of public administration draw from the UN *World Public Sector Report 2005*, Chapter 1, and the proceedings of the workshop on Governance-oriented Innovations to Enhance State Capacity, which was held at the Global Forum on Reinventing Government in Seoul, Republic of Korea, in May 2005. Online: http://6thglobalforum.org/eng/documents/workshops_list.asp?gubun=2&catid=w2.

State — all of which have implications for accountability and responsiveness. As the World Public Sector Report notes, "This vision of responsive governance is far from being realized and embodies some utopian elements. In terms of human resource management (HRM) policies and practices, the implications have not yet been clearly articulated. They could include the need for new kinds of expertise and the development of public service cultures that encourage more diverse forms of knowledge acquisition and dissemination, that is, more sophisticated knowledge management systems and the fostering and development of organizational climates that encourage openness, partnerships and participation as distinct from closure and a primary concern for continuity." This analysis reinforces the emerging consensus and understanding that state capacity no longer solely covers the narrow paradigm of public-sector reforms, but rather encompasses other governing institutions such as the judiciary, legislative and other constitutional bodies.

**larger governance commitments... strive to reconfigure nations' civil service into depoliticized and professional institutions that embody values of efficiency, legitimacy, credibility and ethics...**

Recent years have also witnessed greater regional partnerships aimed at facilitating regional interventions in support of national governance and public administration improvement efforts among LDCs in both Asia and Africa. In Asia these partnerships include Pacific Plan for Strengthening Regional Cooperation and Integration and the Vientiane Plan of Action (2004-2010); in Africa the key initiatives are NEPAD, Africa Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) and the African Charter for the Civil Service. Within larger governance commitments, these initiatives specifically target the enhancement of public administration capacity through knowledge sharing, data collection and partnership support. Moreover, they strive to reconfigure nations' civil service into depoliticized and professional institutions that embody values of efficiency, legitimacy, credibility and ethics, and which are capable of effectively addressing the needs of all people, including those of the vulnerable and marginalized groups.

Despite this clearly discernible evolution in the approach to public administration, and to governance more generally, there is nevertheless wide diversity in terms of how far these approaches have been adopted and applied across countries and regions. Among LDCs, approaches are conditioned by the context in which the reforms take place. At least five different types of context can be identified:

- The first category comprises countries in transition from a centrally planned economy to a market economy. In these countries, public-sector improvement is tackled through incremental reforms that feature flexibility and pragmatism (Cambodia and Lao PDR are examples).
- The second type consists of countries that are emerging from a crisis or war and face the massive task of nation building, and where in most cases the public administration has been largely destroyed. Rehabilitating basic social services and restoring law and order are some of the key priorities, and the sequenced interventions reflect these priorities (Angola, Sierra Leone and Timor-Leste are all examples).
- In the third type of context, public administration reform is based primarily on macroeconomic performance: Restoring fiscal and monetary discipline is the focus, and strict austerity measures are implemented in an effort to restore civil service performance and cost-effectiveness. Countries in this category usually suffer from particularly severe fiscal imbalances and are strongly influenced, through proximity or a shared administrative culture, with one of the more advanced reformers among developed countries. (Several of the Pacific LDCs fall in this category, for example, as described further below).

- The fourth type comprises LDCs that are still in a state of conflict or unsettled peace, and continue to face significant ethnic tension, violence and a general state of insecurity (such as Afghanistan, Haiti, and the Solomon Islands). The priority in these nations is to address the immediate problems of violence and lawlessness while also beginning to tackle the underlying political, social and economic issues.
- And finally, there are a limited number of LDCs where new approaches to governance reform directly can be applied directly. These countries now focus their reforms on increased responsiveness, client focus, output orientation, transparency and accountability. They emphasize ethics and conflicts of interest, cutting back red tape, and enhanced devolution to local governments (examples are Bhutan, Cape Verde, Senegal, Uganda and the United Republic of Tanzania).

**public administration reform in a context of democratization necessarily entails popular empowerment and better recognition of human rights**

A regionally based typology of public-sector reform experiences is difficult to discern consistently. However, there does seem to be a tendency among the Asian LDCs to be less inclined to far-reaching and politically sensitive refoms (like downsizing and devolution) and rather to focus on the modernization of the bureaucracy. This is not surprising, given the successful experiences over the past four decades of several so-called Asian tigers, including Malaysia, the Republic of Korea and Singapore, that have achieved high levels of human development and poverty reduction through top-down development strategies implemented by strong central governments.[79] As a result, the aim of public administration reform is more of a means of supporting economic competitiveness[80] than contributing to the democratization of society.[80]

The Pacific LDCs, meanwhile, borrowed heavily from the NPM model that was supported by development officials in Australia and New Zealand. Apart from Samoa, most of these reforms lack national ownership. The central theme of reforms in the Pacific LDCs was the reduction in overall cost of downsizing of the public service.[81] This was also the case in most African countries, which subsequently experienced a massive influx of external technical assistance that emphasized former colonial powers' administrative models. This explains how remarkably similar recommendations for government reforms have been made across a wide range of LDCs. It also explains why "many of the legal texts and regulations pertaining to the public sector…are not adapted to the specific African socio-cultural landscapes in which they are implemented."[82] This is now changing, and there is a trend in African LDCs to consider bureaucracy reform to be closely connected to the maturing of the democratization process. For some of them, public administration reform in a context of democratization necessarily entails popular empowerment and better recognition of human rights.

---

[79] Training and development have been at the heart of the development strategies of the Asian tigers. Malaysia, the Republic of Korea and Singapore have all built their economic progress on consistent improvements in human development, both in the public and the private sectors.

[80] Economic and private-sector development can provide alternatives for the employment of new graduates and thus relieve pressure on the public service.

[81] In the Cook Islands, public-sector employment was reduced by 57 percent over 1996-1998; in Solomon Islands the payroll was reduced by 9 percent between 1998–2000; in Vanuatu 10 percent of the government workforce was shed in 1996; and even in tiny Niue the public service was slashed by 50 percent in 1995 (See UNDP Regional Centre in Bangkok, *Trends and Challenges in Public Administration Reform in Asia Pacific*, November 2005). With a relatively high per capita government employment rate of one employee for every thirteen citizens, Maldives also needs to give serious consideration to civil service reforms (World Bank, "Public Expenditure Review, Maldives," 2002).

[82] Speech at the signing ceremony of the African Charter of the Public Service.

In summary, the impact of the former colonial powers remains visible today in most LDCs. Asian LDCs seem to have been slightly more successful in securing ownership over the reforms, with Bhutan standing out as the leading example of an LDC that remains cautious in opening up to external influences and the idea of Western-style modernisation. Bhutan continues to promote home-grown solutions in line with its national policy of gross domestic happiness, an approach to development that seeks to achieve harmony between economic forces, the environment and spiritual and economic values (UNDP, HDR Bhutan 2000).[83] This approach is one reason Bhutan has been relatively successful in limiting corruption throughout society.

### Decentralization: Participatory and accountable local-level institutions

Increasingly, LDCs have recognized that effectively meeting people's basic needs and addressing regional and individual inequalities can only be achieved by bringing government closer to the people, so that institutions provide a participatory and accountable process to development. To that end, most LDCs have chosen some form of political, administrative and financial decentralization as a means for sustainable development and achievement of the MDGs. There is much work still to be done in this regard: In most LDCs, structures of local administration exist but are subordinated to the central State. In Africa especially, decentralization has been a difficult process amidst the central State's attempt to expand and secure its control over territory and scarce resources — an often understandable instinct given the relative newness and insecurity of many nations. In addition, central authorities have justified the need for centralized service delivery on poverty and weak capacity at the local level. However, such top down approaches have also not guaranteed delivery of services, a realization that has prompted the recent trend in many LDCs for a more balanced approach to governance and service delivery that strengthens the mandates and functions of local governments and allows for a participatory process to development. Even such trends are not without problems, as indicated by the Ugandan decentralization experience (see Box 2.1). Many argued that Uganda's ambitious centrally directed decentralization programme had created an overly centralized technocratic system on the one hand, and a system of local patronage on the other. Moreover, critics contend, local authorities have limited control over the process. This has led to fears that centre-driven decentralization actually works to consolidate the control of the central government rather than enable local empowerment. Hence the call for "appropriate decentralization" as outlined in the BPoA.

**most LDCs have chosen some form of political, administrative and financial decentralization as a means for sustainable development and achievement of the MDGs**

The current trend in LDCs towards decentralization stems from a number of reasons. One is pressure from external donors on governments to downsize and create leaner, more efficient and enabling state administrations that address the needs of the poor and link good governance to poverty reduction and growth.[84] Another has been a greater need to respond to issues of rapid urbanization and demand for urban infrastructure. More recently, many demands for decentralization stem from sub-national claims for greater autonomy and as a response to economic, fiscal and political crises. Increased democratization and political activism of non-state actors and pressure from civil society

[83] "Gross domestic happiness" rather than GDP (gross domestic product) is how the Government of Bhutan measures development success.

[84] Dele Olowu, "Local Institutional and Political Structures and Processes: Recent Experience in Africa", *Public Administration and Development* , Vol. 23, Issue 1, pp. 41–52, 2003.

## Box 2.1. Decentralization: Lessons from the Ugandan experience

The Ugandan decentralization plan was a comprehensive and well-developed initiative. It attempted to counter the reinforcement of elite power by directly involving local communities in project planning, resource allocation, management and accountability, and improved poverty-focused social investment. Also, to correct regional economic inequalities, the government introduced an equalization grant policy in 1999 that was included in all decentralization plans. Under this policy, which sought to reduce poor performance, the size of the grant was based on nationally determined minimum standards of performance. Areas that performed poorly one year suffered a 20 percent decrease in their share of development finance the following year.

The central government also sought to make the process legitimate by attempting to counter corruption and increase transparency and accountability. It immediately announced — through various open channels, including the radio — how much it had transferred to which locality, for which institution and for what purpose. Consequently, local authorities' opportunities for corruption were significantly reduced because people were able to hold politicians accountable. The local levels also remained accountable to the centre because all districts that received a central grant were required to submit quarterly returns on expenditure. In an effort to strike a balance between the need for central control for accountability and the need for adequate local autonomy, the central government, in the recent 2005/2006 budget statement to Parliament (8 June 2005), decided to abolish the graduated poll tax, which had been the main source of local government revenue. The central government will instead provide local governments with 30 billion Ugandan shillings ($17 million) in compensation. The central government also re-centralized the appointment of the chief administrative officer (CAO) and the payment of salaries for the three top elected officials in local governments.

Unfortunately, the central government to date has been unsuccessful in overcoming resistance to the decentralization process. For one thing, the transfer policy left it with limited powers to intervene. It could not post staff to local government except on consent by local authorities, which many were unwilling to give. Many local authorities hid behind these legal frameworks to engage in financial malpractices, while the central government became a helpless observer.

Furthermore, monitoring and checks and balances between the centre and the local level depend on the central government's capacity, which was often lacking. In addition, lack of effective information system management and an absence of local level data hinder the effectiveness of service delivery. Local governments have severe resource constraints because of their narrow revenue bases and inadequate central fiscal transfers. Evidence points to reluctance on the part of the central government to set up statutory national planning authority and a propensity to increase conditionality. There is no capacity at either the local or central level to submit and systematically use the quarterly budget reports; therefore, it has become a mere bureaucratic formality.

Uganda's decentralization attempts consequently resulted in an unevenly centralized "technocratic mode" on the one hand and a system of local patronage on the other — and despite the limited fiscal transfers, local authorities have limited control over the process. This has led to fears that the centre-driven decentralization effort actually works to consolidate the control of the central government rather than enable local empowerment.

*Source: Paul Francis and Robert James, "Balancing Rural Poverty Reduction and Citizen Participation: The Contradictions of Uganda's Decentralisation Program" in World Development, Vol. 31, No 2, pp. 325-337, 2003; and "Local Governance for Poverty Reduction in Africa," Africa Governance Forum No. 5, Concept Paper, 2002.*

to provide greater opportunities for openness and engagement have also driven the process — as in Ethiopia, Mali and Uganda.

Providing greater local autonomy and devolving decision-making responsibility to local authorities can often, however, risk being empty gestures unless there is a capable centre to enable it. Thus attention has increasingly focused on, for example, fiscal transfer mechanisms; mechanisms for ensuring local level planning and budgeting that are informed by and integrated in national planning and budgeting; systems for monitoring and oversight linked to the budget; and appropriate human resource régimes. Unfortunately, given the persistent resource constraints, fiscal decentralization lags behind political and administrative decentralization in many LDCs. Moreover, the tax base and powers that are delegated or devolved to the local level are very narrow, and often poorly administered. Further limiting local autonomy in most countries is the fact that transfer of funds from the centre to the local level is conditional. For example, in Uganda, which has progressed the furthest in terms of fiscal decentralization, 90 percent of central government transfers are conditional grants.

In Uganda and elsewhere, both downward fiscal and administrative accountability of local governments to its constituents and upward accountability to the central State remain weak. Indeed, high levels of fiscal decentralization are not necessarily indicative of the delivery of pro-poor reforms. Recent research reveals that there is no statistical association between the degree of fiscal decentralization and pro-poor public spending. In fact, research reveals that "governments of countries that are administratively decentralized tend to spend a higher proportion of their revenues on pro-poor social spending while politically decentralized states spend little on social sectors. In addition, there is no consistent, significant statistical association between the degree of fiscal decentralization and pro-poor public spending."[85] Moreover, a major challenge to decentralization has been that it has sometimes worked to reinforce the power of local elites and resulted in worsened spatial inequalities and social divisions. For example, despite considerable decentralization in the Asian region over the past decade, the benefits of development still have not been distributed equitably for the benefit of the poor.

**Providing greater local autonomy and devolving decision-making responsibility to local authorities can often, however, risk being empty gestures unless there is a capable centre to enable it**

## Capacity of state institutions to address governance challenges

The State is the key player among the various actors that contribute to a country's governance. For the State to effectively address the challenges of this role, it has to uphold the norms and values of democratic culture and the rule of law; defend the human rights of its people; and provide political space for the development of non-state actors. Furthermore, it must develop institutions to ensure the thorough and consistent implementation of all responsibilities.

Given the diversity of cultures, histories, geophysical characteristics and realities among LDCs, there is no uniform approach to state capacity development. Reforms are embedded within a long-term process of transformation that requires comprehensive strategies and a coordinated approach. Moreover, reforms are not technically neutral devices that can be implemented regardless of social and political context. Key elements

[85] Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex, UK. Online: www.id21.org/society/s8aas1g1.html.

of the State's capacity to perform its role in governance appropriately include capacity for monitoring and evaluation; performance management and accountability for results; budget and expenditure management; capacity to explore new approaches and innovate; and transparency, accountability and fighting corruption. Each of these five elements is discussed in greater detail below.

### Capacity for monitoring and evaluation

Accurate data and information flows within institutions and between institutions and non-state actors in society are necessary for strengthening capacities for policy development implementation. The development of information management systems is a key imperative in post-conflict LDCs particularly. Appropriate institutional frameworks and organizational practices can help to promote the relative independence and credibility of the public administration in information collecting and sharing, as well as policy development. For example, precise knowledge and information regarding gender issues can greatly assist efforts to make civil service more responsive to the needs of women.

**Democratic developments and technology innovations are fuelling the demand for information, pushing governments in LDCs to move ... to an information-sharing strategy**

In many LDCs, various state agencies lack both capacity and legitimacy to serve as key stakeholders in policy-making processes. In addition, important data often are still unavailable to those who would be most likely to need it in many LDCs because of existing regulations or actual legal constraints. This situation is changing in some areas, however. Democratic developments and technology innovations are fuelling the demand for information, pushing governments in LDCs to move from an information-hoarding attitude to an information-sharing strategy. Uganda and the United Republic of Tanzania are among the LDCs mentioned as models for statistical rigor because they utilize qualified personnel in statistical work to serve as a conduit for policy-making discussions.

### Performance management and accountability for results

Recent reform initiatives have emphasized the importance of performance management in public administration. Most reforms seek to create a system that links organizational goals to work plans, appraisals, trainings and pay and incentives for individuals and teams. In most LDCs, measures to improve productivity have focused far more on salaries than on the enabling environment that facilitates the work of the public servants and can have a longer-term impact on the development of the public administration system. Among the factors that lead to an environment characterized by absenteeism, moonlighting, lack of motivation, weak productivity and corruption are increasing loss of human and motivational capital due to HIV/AIDS, coupled with low public-sector wages, weak regulatory environment and a culture of impunity. Performance management audits are still largely unused, but some countries are now moving from compliance-based financial auditing to performance auditing. For example, in 2001 the Royal Audit Authority (RAA) in Bhutan established a small performance auditing unit that initiated production of a performance-auditing manual and the piloting of a few performance audits. The RAA's institutional capacity is currently being strengthened to scale up this pilot initiative and introduce performance auditing across the administration. The Rwanda Revenue Agency also offers an interesting example of how efficiency and effectiveness in government can be improved even in poor and weak states. Just six years after its transformation, according to independent analysis, the RRA had become a

well-performing and respected institution that helped increase domestic revenue generation from 9.5 percent to 13 percent of GDP.[86]

While increasing pay does not automatically translate into improvements in the effectiveness and efficiency of the public service, there is little likelihood of achieving sustainable reforms without comparatively fair public wages that are able to attract and retain the requisite skills. Decent and liveable wages reflect respect and fairness for the human capital that serves the public. However, if promises for enhanced salaries do not materialize, then it is extremely difficult to restore civil servants' good will towards public service and improved work performance. It should be noted, too, that wage raises are now increasingly being linked to performance.

**there is little likelihood of achieving sustainable reforms without comparatively fair public wages that are able to attract and retain the requisite skills**

Because tackling pay regimes presents numerous challenges for political and institutional reasons, the trend in LDCs has been to introduce various forms of performance-based incentives, including targeted salary reforms (see Box 2.2). To improve implementation and monitoring of government pay policy, a number of countries have also created independent wage and compensation bodies. Malawi established an independent public service remuneration board to oversee the implementation of a medium-term pay policy. The board is composed of seven prominent independent citizens. Bangladesh sets up periodic national pay commissions that comprise members from different sectors of society, including the private sector.

To date, though, research indicates that these efforts have not proven very effective. According to one report, "Whenever such pay increases are announced with great fanfare, there is a simultaneous jump in the prices of essential commodities, leaving almost everyone in society in dire straits,"[87] The results may be disappointing because pay and compensation reforms cannot be done in isolation from other policies, in particular those related to macroeconomic controls, reduction of military expenditures, and measures to reduce corruption and irresponsible management.

Strategies in other LDCs have included introducing special pay scales for the senior civil service, such as in Sierra Leone, and clearly outlining core functions and selective enhanced compensation for technical and professional staff, as in the United Republic of Tanzania.[88] Despite these various efforts, most LDCs are still grappling with the many difficulties related to these reforms.

In addition to reforming pay and compensation systems, recent public administration reforms have also focused on the employment structure of the civil service. The traditional distinction between position and career systems seems to be waning in favour of civil service solutions that incorporate strengths of both, with increasing attention being given to the management of senior civil servants.[89] Timor-Leste, for example, has passed

[86] Land, A., "Developing Capacity for Tax Administration, the Rwanda Revenue Authority", ECDPM. Discussion paper 57D, November 2004.

[87] Habib Zafarullah, Mohammad Mohabbat Khan and Mohammad Habibur Rahman, *Civil Service Systems, Bangladesh.* Paper prepared for the Comparative Civil Service Research Consortium, Indiana University, 2005, p. 13.

[88] Valentine T., "Revisiting and Revising Tanzania's Medium-term Pay Reform Strategy," Public Service Reform Program, December 2001.

[89] A position system is one in which emphasis is placed on selecting the right candidate in open recruitment, while a career system refers to one in which candidates are selected from within a closed recruitment process. While a position-based system can bring new talent into the civil service and free managers to focus on results, a career system is better at providing incentives for good performance and ensuring that investment in training remains within the civil service.

## Box 2.2. Performance pay and compensation reforms in Cambodia and Afghanistan

In an attempt to correct the distortionary problems of donor-driven salary top ups and project implementation units, Cambodia embarked on some far-reaching reforms. The government's so-called rectangular strategy called for 10-15 percent per annum increases in civil service pay. Also, its "priority mission group" scheme was a flexible tool at the disposal of ministries to rapidly increase their capacity to respond to service-delivery bottlenecks or to focus on other strategic tasks. Under this scheme, selected teams of qualified civil servants received adequate remuneration (a special monthly allowance ranging from $48–$130) in return for good performance and adherence to a strict code of ethics as set out in personal service contracts.

However, these reforms were not free of problems. For one thing, the primary mission group initiative risked triggering pressure for additional top ups in other sectors (e.g., police and military). But the greatest risk probably came from parallel donor-funded incentive schemes. For example, the public finance management (PFM) plan, which was supported by several donors, also featured a merit-based pay initiative for officials responsible for the PFM reform agenda. Levels of incentives were up to three times higher than the national scheme, but only 15 percent of the centrally located staff was entitled to participate in it. Thus there was a risk that income inequality would exacerbate not only within the civil service, but among individuals eligible for various incentive systems.

Competition for qualified human resources is more intense than usual in post-conflict settings, e.g., in Afghanistan, where demand largely exceeds supply. This situation drives up salary and remuneration levels and causes inconsistencies between wages paid by government directly and by donor-funded government programmes. In Afghanistan, different solutions were applied to solve these problems. One of the key drivers for structural and functional reforms was the Priority Reform and Restructuring Initiative (PRR). The PRR linked enhanced payment to ministries' initiatives for public-sector reform. Amounts could range from $40 to $500 per month. The Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Fund (ARTF), the European Commission-funded capacity-building groups and USAID all have paid higher salaries to staff who function as advisors under contract. A component of the ARTF also supported the recruitment and payment of expatriate Afghans. It is not yet possible to determine the success of these reforms.

*Sources: Keuleers, Patrick, "An Analysis of Public Administration Reform in Cambodia, Mission Report," UNDP RCB, December 2004; Flaman, R., Discussion paper on UNDP's assistance in the area of merit-based recruitment an local level administrative reform, November 2003.*

a new Public Service Act that is based on a career system while adopting key elements of a position system.

Post-conflict countries in particular seem to attach great importance to the issue of employment and recruitment structures. In 2003, Sierra Leone established a presidential commission to examine and review the structure and capacity of civil service leadership; the commission's goal was to create a so-called senior executive service that has broad management and professional expertise. These reforms are not only important for the recruitment of highly talented future leaders and for inducing a performance-oriented civil service, but also are vital for enhancing the mobility of senior staff within the government. Reform efforts in post-conflict societies also benefit greatly from leadership development programmes. For example, with donor assistance, the Afghan government is currently implementing a strategy to design and launch several competency-based development programmes aimed at building the capacity of the top civil service cadre. Timor-Leste is also in the process of rolling out a leadership and management programme that will target senior and middle level managers in the public service.

Employment structure reforms in LDCs also have recently begun to consider existing gender inequality in the recruitment of public officials in the civil service. The extent to which public administration, as a major employer in LDCs, provides equal opportunities to women and men is important for several reasons. First, the employment practices of the State are a critical opportunity to demonstrate and establish fair standards of employment. Second, employment opportunities relate directly to the social and economic advancement of women's status and their rights. Third, placing women in decision-making positions has the potential to influence national and local priorities and resource allocation decisions so that women's specific needs and concerns are taken into account.

**Employment structure reforms in LDCs also have recently begun to consider existing gender inequality in the recruitment of public officials in the civil service**

### Budget and expenditure management

A paradox faced by poor countries is that capacity to embark on extensive reform initiatives that will increase efficiency and raise revenue requires significant investments — yet the size of available investments is limited by the meagre resources currently available, a limitation due in part to the very failure to raise revenues in the first place. Reducing the size of the civil service has usually been considered a solution for dealing with budgetary constraints and ensuring that LDCs can sustain the financing of a better paid civil service over time. However, while downsizing was the major theme of structural adjustment programmes in the 1980s, a number of LDCs are now increasing their workforces as part of an effort to achieve the MDGs and increase development. For example, Guinea in recent years has concluded that attaining its poverty reduction objectives will require recruitment of an additional 5,000 staff per year. In order to achieve this goal given resource constraints, the government has decided to meet the bulk of its new personnel needs through the recruitment of short-term, contractual employees. It has already initiated this process in the areas of primary education and primary health care, as well as for the agricultural and livestock services and rural works. As a result of this new approach, the actual wage bill in Guinea in 2003 was 6.6 percent higher (10.4 percent in nominal terms) than in 2001. The danger of this approach in a fiscally constrained environment is that non-salary expenditures critical for effective service delivery risk being "crowded out."[90]

In the context of resource constraints, several donors are now advocating for direct budget support that would strengthen recipient countries' financial and management capacity to achieve development goals. Budget support is meant to build national ownership; enhance performance and accountability of all partners in the public finance management system; harmonize performance benchmarks; increase predictability of resources; reduce volatility; and minimize transaction costs by the recipients of aid funds. A number of donors are now moving in this direction in several LDCs, notably African LDCs including Cape Verde, Malawi, Mozambique, Rwanda, Uganda and the United Republic of Tanzania.

But while budget support certainly is an interesting development in the effort to harmonize the aid process and foster national ownership of reforms, a cautious and well-planned approach is needed. In most LDCs, the government institutions required for successful budget support processes are seldom in place. Also, there are a few critical

[90] World Bank, "Strengthening Public Expenditure Management for Poverty Reduction and Growth," *Public Expenditure Review*, Guinea, 2004.

governance sectors that remain by nature outside the realm of the budget support. These include mainly accountability institutions such as anti-corruption bodies, independent media, political parties and oversight institutions as well as, more broadly, the judiciary and legislature. Where conditions are not yet in place to move towards direct budget support, existing pool-funding mechanisms are being used as transitional solutions.

### Capacity to explore new approaches and innovate

**Governments in poor countries face both exceptionally high demands for services, and exceptional challenges in meeting them**

Governments in poor countries face both exceptionally high demands for services, and exceptional challenges in meeting them. Therefore, maintaining flexibility to explore new approaches and to innovate is particularly important. Public administration reforms have experimented with alternative service delivery modalities including agency execution, outsourcing, privatization, NGO execution and private-public partnership, many of which encompass the broader range of actors embraced by the governance paradigm. Such modalities provide opportunities for participatory, inclusive approaches to policy development, service delivery and accountability. Broad participation ensures a more transparent, accountable and fair system of sharing resources and opportunities. It can also help in effectively addressing the demands and requirements of the community in the planning processes. Broad participation can open up real partnership that enhances opportunities for involvement of marginalized groups. Involving all stakeholders can increase the potential of effective implementation and sustainability of the reforms as it creates local ownership over programmes and policies.

NGO execution and public-private partnerships, for instance, have been quite critical in many LDCs in the area of service delivery. For example, in Bangladesh, NGOs are active in areas of education, health services, provisioning of safe water and basic sanitation, and environmental regeneration. Successful private-public partnerships have taken place in Bhutan and Maldives. At the same time it is clear that the engagement of the private sector in service delivery should be approached with caution. In many cases, privatization of basic social services results in private monopoly, high user costs and targeted services for the rich that limit poor people's access to such services. The inclusion of non-state actor in delivering social services is further analyzed in Chapter Three.

### Transparency, accountability and fighting corruption

The renewed calls for "an efficient, accountable and transparent public administration" and the need for a capable State lie at the heart of the current anti-corruption discourse. Corruption is a complex phenomenon, but there is broad consensus that it is principally a governance issue — a failure of institutions.[91] Weak institutions are incapable of supplying society with a framework for competitive processes, and they obstruct the legitimate procedures that link the political and economic areas. Without capacity to manage society by means of a framework of social, judicial, political and economic checks and balances, it becomes difficult for the State to implement and enforce laws and policies that ensure accountability and transparency.[92] However, although the State plays the central role in combating corruption, there is a host of other factors that contribute to strengthening governance systems and processes that ensure accountability, transparency

[91] UNDP, *Fighting Corruption to Improve Governance*, 1999, p. 10.

[92] UNDP, *UNDP Practice Note: Anti-Corruption*, 2004, p. 2.

and integrity. At the top of the list is the need for strong political leadership and commitment as well as broad public participation in fighting corruption. Nevertheless, efforts to build an efficient, accountable and transparent public administration significantly improve the chances of preventing corruption from taking root and from flourishing.

Corruption is one of the key development challenges for LDCs. This section focuses on how corruption undermines the capacity of the State to deliver public services. (Other chapters, meanwhile, discuss how the emergence of broader democratic governance agenda creates conditions in which new avenues and partnerships can be pursued to fight corruption and improve accountability and transparency.)

**efforts to build an efficient, accountable and transparent public administration significantly improve the chances of preventing corruption**

The experiences of Botswana, Burkina Faso, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Mozambique are highlighted in this section. The case study from the Democratic Republic of the Congo paints a complex picture of the serious conditions that need to be overcome and challenges that lay ahead, a situation not uncommon in many LDCs. The Mozambique case disputes the notion that corruption in the public sector exists because of low salaries, while the Burkina Faso experience highlights the role of civil society in jump-starting anti-corruption efforts by the State. The Botswana example illustrates how a former LDC has been able to address the corruption phenomena largely with the help of a dedicated anti-corruption body as the centrepiece of a broader governance reform strategy.

Corruption is a problem in all societies; it exists in both the developed and developing worlds. But some countries are more damaged by it than others. The most significant problems are usually found in countries that have weak states, lack rule of law, and are generally characterized by instability[93], which most often reflect conditions in many LDCs. The example of the Democratic Republic of the Congo (see Box 2.3) elaborates on the complexity of the corruption problem in natural resource-rich LDCs, particularly those in crisis situations, and underscores the enormity of the task at hand.

From an institutional perspective, corruption arises when public officials have wide authority, little accountability and perverse incentives, or when their accountability responds to informal rather than formal forms of regulation. Other factors contribute to this complex phenomenon, and may include the reward structure within the state administration. Corruption tends to thrive when public officials receive meagre salaries, have ample opportunities to be corrupt and are unlikely to be caught or not severely punished even if detected.[94] Nonetheless, higher salaries, increasing either from economic growth and/or cost-effective adjustments to the size of the civil service workforce, are not likely to have the desired effect. Strong political commitment to change attitudes and management culture, to establish meritocratic public service and to strictly enforce anti-corruption regulations are necessary for pay reforms to bring forth accountability and transparency in the bureaucracy. The case of Mozambique illustrates this point.

According to Mozambique's Anti-Corruption Strategy General Guidelines, low salaries in the public sector and the poverty that affects the majority of Mozambicans are not the direct causes of the proliferation of acts and practices of corruption. On the contrary, acts of corruption are committed by some public officials who know the norms and laws and are privy to information but who, motivated by the desire to live in luxury, use their power and knowledge to extort citizens and deplete the State's coffers.

[93] UNDP, *Fighting Corruption to Improve Governance*, 1999, p. 7.

[94] Jon S. T. Quah, "Corruption in Asian Countries: Can It Be Minimized?" *Public Administration Review*. Vol.59, No. 6, 1999, p. 7.

## Box 2.3. The Democratic Republic of the Congo: Natural resource curse, conflict and corruption

The Democratic Republic of the Congo is emerging from a non-democratic past in which fragile state institutions and political leaders placed greater priority on their own personal interests and wealth than on the country's development. Corruption assumed different forms depending on the political and economic circumstances as well as the kind of economic resources in different geographic areas.

Exploitation of natural resources began when the nation was the personal fief of King Leopold of Belgium. Colonialism established a system of mineral exploitation that consisted of extracting raw materials for export, with little or no productive investment in the country from which they were extracted, and little or no effort to protect the environment. This system has remained intact since independence in 1960; the country's enormous wealth continues to attract numerous outsiders who eventually find local collaborators to help them loot natural resources. As in Leopold's day, the national wealth is monopolized by the nation's rulers and their foreign business partners to the detriment of the mass of the people, who remain amongst the poorest of the global poor.

While complex links between low-level and grand corruption can clearly be identified in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, it is difficult to establish a linear causal order. On the one hand, the massive occurrence of petty corruption corroded the effectiveness of internal and external control and created the enabling environment for grand corruption to go undetected and unpunished. On the other, grand corruption legitimized and nurtured low-level corruption as a way to achieve the complicity required to ensure impunity.

Low level or petty corruption, also often referred to as *tracasseries*, strangled the everyday life of the citizenry, with a disproportionately severe impact on the poorest. The systemic demand of under-the-table payments to deliver virtually all public services and the extortion of bribes in apparent law enforcement activities pushed poor households into even deeper poverty and constituted a barrier to access to basic public services, such as health and education.

Pervasive corruption in the tax and customs services, as well as in public purchasing orders, also led to the massive loss of public resources. According to estimates of the international NGO Innovative Resource Management, in 2002 only 4 percent of the total taxes collected on the nation's waterways were actually turned over to the National Treasury; the remaining 96 percent was being pocketed by public-sector agents (IRM, 2004).

In Mozambique, corruption is promoted and reinforced by bureaucratic inertia and many public officials' refusal to condemn such behaviour. In Mozambique and many other countries, corruption deeply permeated the ethical and moral fabric, thus increasing widespread tolerance to its practice. It subsequently became considered an acceptable alternative route to the accumulation of wealth. For anti-corruption efforts to be successful in such a context, there is a need for a strategy that entails three interrelated and complementary stages: prevention, administrative action and judicial action. This strategy also requires strong political leadership and coordinated participation of all actors, including the State, civil society and the private sector. Participation and transparency are the key elements for administrative management's enhanced accountability and adaptability. These two elements contribute towards democratization, the development of professionalism and ethics within the government as well as towards curbing corruption in the public sector.[95]

Evidence suggests that grand corruption[96], coupled with almost total impunity, not only undermined the already thin legitimacy of the State but also led to a horrendous waste of economic resources dearly needed to alleviate the extreme poverty suffered by more than 80 percent of the Congolese population. State-owned companies and the national financial system were largely used as a personal purse. Part of the embezzled money was used to support political parties, while large-scale public procurement contracts as well as mining or forest licenses generally included juicy "commissions."

There were complex links among the different levels of corruption and the different levels in the hierarchy chain. One of them existed in a distribution system where lower-ranking officials passed on some of their "revenues" to higher-ranking or more senior officials. For example, public officials of the customs authority who were responsible for filling positions expected to receive regular payments in return for an appointment; otherwise, the agent might be removed (OAC, 2005). Senior level traffic police officers required their subordinates to achieve certain "quotas" paid in illegitimate fines; the money collected was then distributed to the senior official, who pocketed the lion's share. Hence, the so-called coping strategies of miserably paid low-level public officials became entangled with a systematic pattern of greed for self-enrichment.

Meanwhile, a more explosive intertwining of petty and grand corruption in the exploitation of natural resources continued to fuel armed violence in the eastern part of the country, thus hindering the State's ability or inclination to take effective control of its territory (and thus its national wealth). The permeation of state institutions by illicit commercial networks created an enabling environment for conflict.[97] Petty corruption, in particular in the customs and tax services, was embedded and fed into the higher-level corrupt systems facilitating the arms trade, smuggling and money laundering.

A major challenge for the preparation of future strategies to fight corruption consists in finding a solution to cut through this Gordian knot: Can the effective control of petty corruption prepare the ground to address grand corruption, which is more difficult to tackle due to the involvement of important political figures? Or, assuming that the control of petty corruption is impossible in a context of rampant grand corruption, how can the vicious circle of grand corruption feeding on itself be broken?

*Sources: Georges Nzongola-Ntalaja, "The International Dimensions of the Congo Crisis," UNDP, online:* www.undp.org/oslocentre/docs05/The%20International%20Dimensions%20of%20the%20Congo%20Crisis.pdf*; Dani Wadada Nabudere, "The Political Economy of Conflict and War in the Great Lakes Region," online:* www.ijr.org.za/publications/nabudere*; and Karen Hussmann and Marie-Ange Bunga, "Anti-Corruption Case Study on DRC,"UNDP, 2005.*

The public management view of corruption is clear-cut. Corruption is anathema to the bureaucratic values of equity, efficiency, transparency, and honesty. It weakens the ethical fabric of the civil service and prevents the emergence of a well-performing gov-

[95] Republic of Mozambique, Anti-Corruption Strategy General Guidelines (2005-2009), Maputo, Mozambique, September 2005, p. 5. (Document approved by the Cabinet at the 24th Session on 6 September 2005).

[96] This was characterized by the involvement of high-level politicians or senior civil servants who took advantage of their positions to enrich themselves or to stay in power. At its highest level, grand corruption often involved large international bribes, secret bank accounts and the plundering of public assets such as state-owned companies, natural resources, etc. (see Utstein Forum; online: www.u4.no ).

[97] For former President Mobuto Sese Seko, all that mattered was the amount of money foreign businesses were prepared to pay up front to win lucrative contracts and the percentage of earnings that later went back to political authorities or warlords. Rebel groups, beginning with Joseph Kabila's AFDL, discovered that making deals in this manner was a good way of raising money for warfare. (See Nzongola-Ntalaja, "International Dimensions of the Congo Crisis," online: www.undp.org/oslocentre/docs05/The%20International%20Dimensions%20of%20the%20Congo%20Crisis.pdf.).

ernment capable of developing and implementing public policies that promote social welfare. The machinery of modern government, as it evolved in industrialized countries and has been transferred to developing countries, includes systems that protect public organizations from corruption and promote accountability. These systems include a meritocratic civil service, watchdogs such as supreme audit institutions, ombudsmen and public service commissions. Under the new public management model, corruption "risk management" provides the framework for reforms to improve government performance. This is accomplished through strong financial management control systems and a renewed emphasis on the ethical values of public service. While economies may still grow in countries in which corruption is entrenched in the public sector, the public management view is that successive stages of economic and social development will be harder if not impossible to achieve without well-performing government. Ultimately, countries need to create durable institutions to foster integrity in public life if public policy is to achieve the objectives (such as poverty reduction and environmental protection) that are at the core of sustainable economic and social development.[98]

**While economies may still grow ... successive stages of economic and social development will be harder if not impossible to achieve without well-performing government**

The democratic governance model follows the basic premise of the public management view, but assumes a broader remit. Democratic governance dictates that although the State has the central role in addressing development challenges, there are other critical actors that can contribute, including civil society and the private sector. In the fight against corruption, these non-state actors have a crucial role in raising public awareness of the dire consequences of corruption and in facilitating the required dialogue in initiating reforms; monitoring government commitments to improve accountability and performance; setting higher ethical standards for conducting business; and providing alternative options, particularly when information is suppressed. The example of the Réseau National de Lutte Anti-corruption (RENLAC)[99] in Burkina Faso illustrates how civil society efforts contribute particularly to state interventions in building accountability and transparency. (The role of these non-state actors in improving governance and development will be elaborated further in Chapters Three and Four.)

In Burkina Faso, recent interventions are the fruit of a long process of engagement with all the relevant stakeholders on the ground, with the goal of achieving a broad-based national consensus on policy priorities in the area of anti-corruption programming. This process started in earnest with the elaboration of a national human development report (NHDR)[100] on corruption in 2003. The NHDR helped to focus attention on the problem of corruption and to establish a platform of consensus regarding the nature of the problem and priority areas to be addressed. Before its publication, it was difficult to get local actors to admit that corruption actually constituted a problem that needed to be addressed. One organization that has played a key role in this awareness-raising campaign is the civil society group RENLAC, which has a broad membership and a solid nationwide base. It works mainly by publicizing instances of corruption in the press.

[98] The World Bank, *Helping Countries Combat Corruption: Progress at the World Bank since 1997*, Washington. World Bank OCS/ PREM, 2000, p. 17. Online: www1.worldbank.org/publicsector/anticorrupt/helpingcountries.pdf.

[99] In English: National Network to Fight Corruption

[100] NHDRs are supported by UNDP. They are intended as tools for national policy debate, with the goal of placing human development at the forefront of the national political agenda. NHDRs are also a tool for policy analysis reflecting people's priorities, strengthening national capacities, engaging national partners, identifying inequalities and measuring progress.

With support from international donors, RENLAC has become a credible and even essential partner for government and for all those working in the area of anti-corruption. Most government institutions, namely the police and customs, are now willing to cooperate with RENLAC. Prior to the publication of the NHDR, RENLAC's reports were largely ignored by the government (although they were quite widely read by the public).[101]

The importance of fighting corruption in the poorest countries of the globe is best underlined by the following figures estimating losses in investments towards development due to bribery, money laundering and corruption. The World Bank Institute estimates that the total amount of bribes paid around the world is at least $1 trillion per year, more than 10 times the total annual amount of development aid disbursed.[102] Money laundering remains the world third-largest business, estimated by the IMF to be worth about $500 billion a year. By means of comparison, the latest Human Development Report 2005 estimates that about $300 billion is needed to lift the world's one billion poorest people out of their extreme poverty. These estimates reinforce that report's projections that most countries will not achieve the MDGs. The report concludes that by 2015, some 380 million people will still be poverty-stricken despite the pledges made in the Millennium Declaration in 2005.[103]

Seen through the democratic governance lens, corruption cannot co-exist with economic growth. As poverty and inequity are exacerbated by this phenomenon, problems escalate within the LDC context. Corruption diverts already meagre resources from LDC coffers and reduces income from tax and customs fees from an already depleted revenue base. Corruption endangers the stability of already fragile democratic institutions in LDCs and discriminates in the delivery of government services. It renders regulations ineffective, increases criminality and breeds conflict. More importantly, high levels of corruption significantly aggravate poverty. In LDCs, where the poor already suffer because of inherent development challenges, the detrimental effects of corruption place an even heavier burden on those who have few resources to pay bribes.

Corruption exacerbates discrimination, injustice and disrespect for human dignity. As such, an increased emphasis on human rights is a key element in democratic governance and for achieving the MDGs. Where corruption reigns, basic human rights and liberties come under threat, and social and economic contracts become unpredictable. States need to take the necessary steps to ensure that inequity and discrimination do not obstruct their citizens' efforts to exercise their rights to development, employment, food, health, education and other basic human rights. The fight against corruption must be made a top priority at all levels, and the responsibility of poor and wealthy nations alike; furthermore, it should involve both the public and private sectors as well as civil society organizations.

**Many LDCs now recognize the barriers posed by corruption in achieving the MDGs and the need for more home-grown initiatives**

Many LDCs now recognize the barriers posed by corruption in achieving the MDGs and the need for more home-grown initiatives. With support from civil society and the international community, they have begun to focus on domestic capacity-development efforts to strengthen institutional mechanisms for fighting corruption. To that end, a growing number have established or are beginning to create anti-corruption bodies

[101] Sebastian Silva Leander, "Burkina Faso Case Study on Anti-Corruption," UNDP, 2005.

[102] Nguyen, L. "Poor Victimized by Extortion, Large and Small." Inter Press Service News Agency, 20 September 2005. See also www.worldbank.org/wbi/governance/mediamentions-current.html.

[103] UNDP, "Human Development Report 2005: International Cooperation at Crossroads: Aid, Trade, and Security in an Unequal World," 2005.

(Bangladesh, Malawi, the United Republic of Tanzania) or have passed or are currently preparing anti-corruption legislation (Cambodia, the Lao PDR) that include measures to strengthen enforcement and monitoring mechanisms.

The commonly recognized good practice of the Botswana Directorate on Corruption and Economic Crime (DCEC) proves that LDCs, when armed with strong political commitment and dedicated resources, are able to overcome some of the key challenges in the fight against corruption. Even in light of the overall success in Botswana, a former LDC, problems remain however. One such problem is the perception that the DCEC simply has not gone after the "big fish" and instead investigates mostly low-level government officials. Nonetheless, the DCEC stands out as one of the few models patterned after the oft-cited success of the Hong Kong Independent Commission Against Corruption that has actually made some headway in combining the three-pronged approach of investigation, prevention and education. Although there are no "quick fixes" or blueprints to fight corruption, and intentions still outnumber accomplishments, the experience of Botswana provides some important lessons for LDCs (see Box 2.4).

## Capacity of state institutions to address economic challenges

The primary broad economic challenges of LDCs are fostering macroeconomic stability and enhancing economic growth to promote human development and poverty reduction. To that end, most countries have undertaken institutional reforms aimed at improving budgetary and tax system management; establishing low inflation rates, fiscal discipline, tight monetary policies, better coordinated and market-based interest and exchange rate regimes; and creating a better economic environment for private investment. Many LDCs are now running smaller budget deficits, meeting their targets for revenue mobilization more frequently and improving the transparency and accountability of their fiscal systems. They are also instituting better procurement rules and strengthening their audit systems. Many LDCs have fairly open economies; thirty-one LDCs are already members of the World Trade Organization (WTO), and others have the status of observer and are in the process of becoming members.

**A review of economic governance in LDCs over the years indicates that in a globalized world these countries had and still have little policy space and autonomy**

A review of economic governance in LDCs over the years indicates that in a globalized world these countries had and still have little policy space and autonomy. Their pronounced economic weakness, over-dependence on external development partners and lack of national capacities have always subjected them to conditionalities, pressures and policy dictates from outside. The structural adjustment era of the 1980s and the 1990s bear testimony to these weaknesses. In many ways, globalization has made the situation worse because of the overall shrinking of domestic policy space, loss of further capacities due to brain drain and emergence of new rules, new tools and new institutions on the global scene.

Assessments of the economic performance of LDCs and their persistent obstacles indicate that if state institutions are to be effective in addressing economic challenges, State capacity has to be developed on three fronts: priority and objective setting, policy analysis and policy formulation, and monitoring and evaluation. Each of these issues is discussed in greater detail below. In addition, it is critical for governments in LDCs to engage in meaningful dialogue on economic issues with external development partners and in global forums.

## Box 2.4. Botswana Directorate on Corruption and Economic Crime (DCEC)

Corruption was relatively unknown in Botswana politics until the early 1990s, and the public service prided itself on being free from corruption. Then, however, several cases of high-level corruption were uncovered by three consecutive presidential commissions. These revelations prompted the government in 1994 to establish the Directorate on Corruption and Economic Crime (DCEC) within the Office of the President.

The DCEC distinguishes itself from other similar bodies in Africa primarily in that it has not merely replicated the three-pronged approach of investigation, prevention and education of the Hong Kong Independent Commission Against Corruption, but has also achieved successful outcomes in complementing the other institutions within the country that have been established with the purpose of improving governance and deepen accountability and transparency. Several reasons have been given for this success, including that the statutes of DCEC specify that it is an independent agency with responsibility for providing community outreach programmes to public and private sectors on the cost of corruption; that the other core bodies making up the National Integrity System work relatively well; and that political and incentive structure in Botswana contributes to the important role the agency plays in complementing the core institutions. Additionally, the DCEC has a predictable operating budget ($2.4 million allocated in 2001–2002 and $2.2 million the previous year).

A number of factors have helped hinder the effectiveness of the DCEC, however. Although the judiciary is considered to be fully independent and free to discharge its responsibilities without fear or favour, and has fulfilled its responsibility of convicting and sentencing those guilty of corruption, there are several instances when trials have been delayed. This has affected the conviction rates of the cases brought before the courts by the DCEC. Cases have also been delayed within the Attorney General's Chamber, which has further compounded the problem. In both cases these shortcomings can be attributed to a lack of staff as well as resources. In response, the DCEC has developed its own resources and capacity to prosecute corruption cases. Damage has already been done, however, in terms of the public's perception of efforts made to combat corruption. Allegations have also been made that the DCEC is going after the cases of low-level corruption while ignoring the 'big fish'.

The placement of the DCEC within the Office of the President has raised the question of whether or not the DCEC is sufficiently independent to carry out its mandate. This could be addressed by requiring the DCEC to report to the National Assembly rather than to the President. A further issue that has been raised is that the Director of the DCEC does not have security of tenure. In the case of the Office of the Ombudsman — also part of the public service, like the DCEC — it has been claimed that it does not have sufficient independence to fulfil its mandate effectively. Calls have been made for the relevant legislation to be amended.

Unlike the DCEC and the Office of the Ombudsman, the Auditor General is independent and enjoys security of tenure. It is perceived that the Auditor General has been very active and effective in reporting on and exposing cases of corruption and misuse of public funds. Observers also claim, however, that the National Assembly has failed to act on the recommendations contained within these reports.

Finally, it is notable that the DCEC gives priority to investigating corruption that has affected the poor.

*Source: Patrick Keuleers and Nils Taxell, "Institutional Arrangements to Combat Corruption: A Comparative Study," UNDP, October 2005, pp. 44-47.*

### Priority and objective setting

Economic challenges of LDCs are often inadequately addressed because development objectives and priorities are not tailored to their national contexts. Processes related to poverty reduction strategy papers (PRSPs) and, more recently and in greater depth, to the MDGs, are good examples. Tailoring objectives effectively requires technical skills, meaningful consultations, inclusion and participation at both national and local levels. Broad-based partnerships with all stakeholders — governments, communities, civil society, the private sector, external development partners — are essential. Furthermore, the dialogue needs to lead to realistic options for citizens' participation.

**Economic challenges of LDCs are often inadequately addressed because development objectives and priorities are not tailored to their national contexts.**

In Timor-Leste, for example, nearly 40,000 people across the country expressed their opinion on the MDG goals and overwhelmingly urged their leaders to focus on basic health and primary education. The PRSP discussion, particularly with regard to objectives and goals, in the United Republic of Tanzania included a number of NGOs making significant contributions to priority setting. In Rwanda, the government used the goals as common ground to engage with civil society groups on issues related to post-conflict recovery. For both poverty reduction strategies and PRSPs, broad-based consultations among a representative range of national stakeholders took place in LDCs including Djibouti, Ethiopia and the Gambia. The dialogues at both national and local level have involved parliament, local government and civil society organizations, including community-based organizations, the private sector, academia, research institutes and the media. These consultations have contributed to greater national ownership of strategies by fostering national debates, creating greater public awareness of poverty issues and sharpening understanding of poverty reduction policies. National stakeholders have provided critical substantive inputs into PRSP formulation, such as through analytical work and background studies on gender equality (Cambodia, the Gambia and Niger); environmental sustainability (Burkina Faso and Guinea): HIV/AIDS (Burundi, Cameroon, Ethiopia and Uganda); and food security (Eritrea and Ethiopia).

### Policy analysis and policy formulation

In LDCs, perhaps the weakest link between state capacity and economic challenges is in the area of policy analysis and policy formulation. Enhanced capacity is needed for more pragmatic, meaningful and transparent policy formulation by LDCs.

Good policy analysis requires dependable information in terms of credible data and statistics as well as improved human resources. Both require training and skills enhancement, institutional strengthening and a proper incentive structure. In many LDCs, planning commissions or planning units responsible for policy analysis are relatively weak. Similarly, policy units of sectoral ministries have not been strengthened. Powerful ministries and organizations, such as finance ministries and central banks, often marginalize weaker ministries, particularly in the social sectors. In some LDCs, such as Cambodia, capacity has been developed on building up institutions for research and policy analysis.

Keeping in mind key issues of independence, incentives and sustainability, policy formulation capacities need to encompass the following broad policy areas:

- **Macroeconomic stability, economic growth and human development**.

Frequently, poor policy articulation means that tensions among various state units result in misguided trade-offs. For example, finance ministries and central banks often pursue macroeconomic stability with limited consideration for other socio-economic objectives.

As a result, budgets are balanced at the cost of long-term human development. Macroeconomic stability and human development are hardly "either-or" questions, however. Although macroeconomic stability is an essential prerequisite for economic growth and human development, it should not be pursued as the only development objective and priority. Thus, policy coherence and balance are important.

▸ **Poverty reduction strategies**. In many LDCs, poverty reduction strategy initiatives are suffering on several fronts. External partners sometimes press for a fresh start when policy makers are already in the process of developing national strategies as part of the PRSP process (or have already completed them). MDGs and other national development goals are often not integrated into PRSPs. In a few cases, the links between poverty reduction strategies and other reform issues (such as governance, the environment and gender equity) are not well established. Improving the effectiveness of poverty reduction strategies requires developing capacities to formulate macroeconomic policy and sectoral strategies, including pro-poor policies. Needs-assessment methodologies should be prepared, as should handbooks and guides for integrating MDGs into PRSPs. The MDGs were fully incorporated as the long-term goals of PRSPs in such LDCs as Cambodia, Ethiopia, the United Republic of Tanzania and Yemen; linkages between MDGs and poverty reduction strategies and PRSPs were also established in Rwanda and Zambia. Policies for pro-poor employment generation and labour market reforms have been undertaken in Cameroon, Comoros, the Gambia and Guinea.

▸ **Domestic resource mobilization and expenditure rationalization**. Fiscal discipline has improved in some LDCs, but profligate spending remains a problem in many others. Spending pressures in some countries may come from post-conflict reconstruction or recent democratization processes (notably elections). Low investments and savings remain a key constraint to macroeconomic stability and economic growth in LDCs. Among key measures to improve investments are reducing rent seeking; removing business uncertainty and establishing credibility in public policies; fostering public trust in markets and firms; and ensuring that policy and institutional responses are based on local conditions, capacities and priorities. However, increasing investment does not automatically mean economic growth. In fact, some countries that have achieved high rates failed to reap the benefits in growth, which suggests low efficiency of resource use.

On the revenue side, there is often the need to modernize tax laws and improve the tax administration in LDCs. Regressive tax structures, loopholes in tax laws and inefficiency in tax administration are common in many LDCs. More progressive tax rates and a broad tax base gained through focusing more on direct taxes (such as income tax) could have powerful poverty-reducing effects, especially if combined with improved rates of tax collection. Government revenue reforms in Bangladesh and Rwanda have effectively dealt with some of these issues. In terms of expenditure rationalization, restructuring expenditures with more funds directed toward human development is a major economic challenge in many LDCs. Efficiency and accountability in resource use can help these countries to achieve their development goals. Capacity development in budget preparation, improved skills in the use of fiscal instruments and better transparency and accountability can contribute substantially.

**The major impediments to private-sector development in LDCs are governance-related: bureaucracy, inefficiency and corruption**

▸ **Fostering private-sector development**. The major impediments to private-sector development in LDCs are governance-related: bureaucracy, inefficiency and corruption. Doing business remains difficult, especially in Africa. For example, in one LDC it takes

19 procedures and 75 days to start a business, and 52 procedures and 526 days to enforce a contract.[104] Additionally, privatization remains uneven. In some cases, it has led to higher unemployment and higher costs of goods and services — and privatization has often merely replaced government monopolies with private monopolies, generating all the disadvantages of the latter without any of the benefits of the former.

Adherence to recognized and rigorously enforced transparent rules and regulations is required for the expansion of the private sector and good economic governance. These rules and regulations must be recognized and enforced in both the private and public spheres. For good corporate governance, relevant government departments need to be aware of the existing bodies of laws or conventions on corporate governance. To this end, they require an up-to-date information base and the ability to devote as much effort to analyzing relevant global and regional conventions as to national law.

### Monitoring and evaluation

The development of effective institutions for monitoring and evaluation is essential to adequately address LDCs' economic challenges. Monitoring and evaluation identifies the progress and gaps in development, which can help formulate future policies. It also identifies individuals and organizations responsible for various duties and provides information on how well they are meeting their obligations.

Data and statistics are critical components of monitoring and evaluation. A thorough approach would consist of developing a comprehensive statistical structure with benchmark surveys; systems for data collection through censuses and surveys; provisions for gender-sensitive and disaggregated data on the basis of regional differences, socio-economic groups and ethnic disparities; means for updating the system regularly; and systematic dissemination of information. Even though all elements of this thorough approach have not been introduced in many LDCs, some countries (Lesotho, Malawi and Senegal) have been able to do capacity development in areas of poverty assessment and monitoring through strengthening national statistical offices. Cambodia and Mozambique have developed systems for PRSP monitoring. "Observatories," or decentralized systems for monitoring economic and social trends, have been established in Burkina Faso, Cape Verde, Haiti and Senegal.

**Capacity development implies strengthening national statistical units through better mandates, improved human resources and more financial resources.**

Substandard capacity in national statistical offices due to absence of human and financial resources is common in many LDCs. Capacity development implies strengthening national statistical units through better mandates, improved human resources and more financial resources. More emphasis should be placed on methodologies, statistical techniques and instruments and setting up of systems.

### Engaging with external partners

State capacity is necessary for government to engage effectively with external development partners. Two key strategies should be considered: collaborating with external development partners to define priorities and set objectives, and determining how to be a meaningful, effective partner with external development actors. The first requires con-

[104] Andy Mold, *Trade Preferences and Africa: The State of Play and the Issues at Stake*, UN ECA (United Nations Economic Commission for Africa), 2005. Online: www.uneca.org/eca_programmes/trade_and_regional_integration/meetings/TunisNovember2004/African%20trade%20and%20preferences%20-%20Tunsia%20version.pdf.

stant engagements in terms of discussion and dialogue with the external development partners, impressing on them that their role is to support national objectives and priority-setting and to align their goals and priorities with national ones. The second requires in-house capacity development in terms of analytical work, policy analysis and understanding of issues.

The issue of state capacity and effectiveness of institutions assumes significant importance with regard to negotiations at various global forums. This is because most of the external economic challenges that LDCs face — and which they influence the least — are discussed and decided at these gatherings. The challenges include trade, access to markets (particularly for landlocked LDCs like Nepal and Rwanda), foreign direct investment (FDI), ODA, debt burden and debt relief. National institutional capacity needs to be developed so that LDCs can effectively articulate their priorities and fight for them at global forums. In some cases, collective positions by LDCs can make a difference. For example, the issue of cotton subsidies has received major international attention recently, at least in part because strong collective action on the part of Benin, Burkina Faso, Chad and Mali at WTO meetings.

## Capacity of state institutions to address human development needs

Despite great challenges and constraints, most LDCs have made important strides in human development since their independence. Yet the shortfalls remain immense. Meeting the needs of large populations of poor people places a strain on public administrations everywhere, but constraints in LDCs are particularly severe. These countries also find it more difficult than most others to take measures to rectify regional inequities by providing greater resources to poorer areas — or to ensure that inequities within regions, such as between fixed and nomadic peoples, or between different ethnic groups, are not worsened. But while some governments devote about a third of their budgets to health and education, most LDCs spend very little of theirs on poor people — that is, on the services poor people need to improve their health and education.

### Effective public-service delivery in the face of fiscal constraints

LDCs face a unique set of challenges that place an additional burden on already weak state capacity. These challenges, which are described below in detail, include rapid urbanization; geographic and infrastructure constraints to rural service delivery; HIV/AIDS in capacity-constrained contexts; conflicts that threaten institutional stability and service delivery; threats to environmental sustainability; and natural disaster risks.

**LDCs face a unique set of challenges that place an additional burden on already weak state capacity**

**Rapid urbanization**. The rapid growth of urban populations is one of the most striking features of the demographic shift taking place in LDCs today. In these countries, about 26 percent of the population lives in urban areas; by 2015, one in every three people will live in urban areas. Most of the current urban growth in LDCs is due to natural population increase, transformation of formerly rural areas on the periphery to urban areas and rural-urban migration.

The increase in urban population is accompanied by a major surge in the number of urban poor, a development that places even greater strain on central governments. As a result, many governments have chosen to decentralize and allow local governments to

address and manage various problems unique to the urban context. These problems are interrelated and are as follows: large and growing backlogs in delivery of basic service to urban residents as demand outstrips institutional capacity; scarce financial resources and environmental carrying capacity; increasing inequality in cities, manifested in stark residential segregation; increasing violence that disproportionately affects women and the poor; and limited access to shelter and security of tenure, which has resulted in severe overcrowding, homelessness and environmental health problems.

**Given that most urban population growth is occurring in poor, informal and unplanned settlements, the task of reaching the underserved in LDCs has become increasingly difficult**

Worsening access to shelter and security of tenure greatly impede delivery of basic services, thus exacerbating inequality and poverty within a city. Given that most urban population growth is occurring in poor, informal and unplanned settlements, the task of reaching the underserved in LDCs has become increasingly difficult. Because informal settlements usually do not contribute to the tax base, they are often not considered when decisions are made about allocation of resources; instead, formal investment is targeted at planned areas where legal status is clear and investment risks are low. Delivery of effective services to the urban poor requires efforts to balance technical, institutional, social, financial and economic constraints and requirements. Among the major constraints to urban service delivery are poor people's ability to afford even the most basic services; insecure tenure; the unplanned and ad hoc nature of settlements; inflexible technical standards; poor management; inappropriate policy; and inadequate legislative frameworks.

In many cases, the failure to extend services is a result of rigid or outdated policy and legislation as well as a lack of official recognition of the magnitude and scale of the problem. Residents in informal settlements often lack access to adequate and affordable basic water supplies, sanitation services and housing. They may have limited or no access to other infrastructure and services such as solid waste disposal, storm drainage, street lighting, roads and footpaths. As a result, poor urban households are more vulnerable to natural disasters and are often exposed to multiple diseases. Additionally, the urban poor in informal settlements often pay more than residents in the formal city for services of much lower quality. In African cities, the urban poor who are deprived of access to clean water have to pay street vendors as much as 5 to 20 times more than what their affluent neighbours pay for municipal supplies.[105] Yet even in such dire situations, a lot can be achieved through innovative approaches (see Box 2.5).

Given the complexities that often surround the delivery of water and sanitation services to the urban poor, coupled with the weak capacity of many local municipalities, alternative and innovative methods of service delivery have become crucial. Creative service-delivery methods involving the domestic private sector and civil society organizations in partnership with the public institutions can be more efficient than sole government provision. For example, the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-HABITAT) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) are working together to build capacity for improved management and access to water in several African cities in both LDCs and non-LDCs. They are seeking improvements in urban water management and delivery by sharing best practice knowledge, linking sector professionals and working with various development partners and stakeholders. However, it is still government's responsibility to monitor closely, regulate and provide effective leg-

[105] United Nations, *Supporting Africa's Efforts to Achieve Sustainable Development: Dialogues at the Economic and Social Council*, New York, ECOSOC, 2002, p. 118.

## Box 2.5. Effective urban service delivery: Burkina Faso's innovative arrangement in sanitation management

Ouagadougou, the capital of Burkina Faso, has an estimated population of 900,000, representing 60 percent of the country's total urban population. In 1991, about 70 percent of the population used traditional pit latrines, 18 percent used improved latrines, 5 percent had built septic tanks and 7 percent were without facilities. Only 38 percent of households had adequate access to clean water. As a result of poor water connections and inadequate sanitation services, one in every four medical visits was attributed to water and excreta-related diseases.

To improve the poor sanitation situation, the Municipality of Ouagadougou entered into a partnership in 1985 with an autonomous public water and sanitation utility, L'Office National de l'Eau et de l'Assainissement (ONEA). In an effort to introduce a sustainable financing arrangement for on-site sanitation, the municipality and ONEA developed a "sanitation surtax" financed entirely by local resources. The surtax, which is charged to all households, is used to subsidize improved household and public latrines. The funds collected are deposited into a dedicated sanitation account managed by ONEA; from this account, households receive financial and technical assistance for ventilated improved pits and pour flush latrines, soak-away pits and improved bathrooms.

Through this surcharge, $500,000 was collected by 1999, and a total of 20,000 sanitary facilities were developed. Additionally, all public primary schools now have sanitation facilities, a development that benefits some 100,000 children. At present, the subsidy more or less covers the additional costs of the improved standard of sanitation services and the use of approved contractors. Technical standards provided by ONEA aim to keep costs moderate, and construction is carried out by local masons who are trained and registered by ONEA, with support from the municipality and local NGOs. This "sanitation surtax" approach is currently being extended to Bobodiolasso, the second-largest city in Burkina Faso.

*Source: "Better Water and Sanitation for the Urban Poor: Good Practices from Sub-Saharan Africa," Water Utility Partnership for Capacity Building Africa, 2003.*

islative and financial support to these actors, which in turn requires new forms of capacity to be developed.

**Geographic and infrastructure constraints to rural service delivery**. Despite the rapid growth of the urban populations in LDCs, some three quarters of the world's poor still live in rural areas. According to most projections, a majority of them will continue to live in rural areas well into the 21st century. This indicates that the high aggregate level of poverty in LDCs has specific rural dimensions. Therefore, it is imperative to examine service delivery in rural areas because it directly affects efforts to achieve the MDGs and sustainable human development.

The rural poor depend primarily on agriculture and related activities for their livelihoods. In the LDC context, rural areas are often neglected in service delivery because many state administrations are physically unable to bridge the distance between villages and urban administrative centres. Geographic constraints also increase the cost of service delivery, thus making it unaffordable for many governments. This is especially true in Small Island States. In addition, the urban bias present in many LDC administrative policies means that human and financial resources are concentrated in urban areas. For example, qualified teachers and health workers tend to leave villages to go to cities for better living and working conditions, thus diminishing both the quality and quantity of service delivery in rural areas.

Physical assets such as water, cooking fuel and technology are both central to the lives of the rural poor, yet they are rarely provided in rural areas in LDCs. Inadequate access to physical assets not only has a huge impact on agricultural production and individual lives, but it also affects women disproportionately since they are the primary consumers of such services (see Box 2.6). Similarly, lack of education and knowledge means that rural people are often inadequately equipped to deal with modern technology and better cope with the fluctuations and demands of the market.

Poor service delivery and inadequate basic infrastructure also affect the demand for basic services among rural poor. Given the great distance from a village to the nearest school or hospital in many LDCs, the majority of poor families cannot afford the time or money needed to send their children to schools or to visit hospitals in times of illness. In Bhutan, for example, half the population lives in remote areas and is thus without access to roads, electricity, piped water or telephones. They are far from schools, health clinics, markets and public transportation, nearly all of which are in cities. These limitations affect people's human capital accumulation as well as human development and dignity.

Lastly, market access and information are critical in overcoming rural poverty. Effective participation in markets allows rural inhabitants to profitably gain from agricul-

## Box 2.6. Centrality of physical infrastructure in rural development: Water provisioning in rural Bangladesh

Bangladesh's economy is largely rural based and its major rural resources are cultivable land, labour and water. However, the productivity of both land and labour is low due to inadequate water provision infrastructure. To address this problem, the Bangladesh Local Government Engineering Department (LGED), with the help of NGOs, implemented a small-scale water resources development project in acutely impoverished rural western Bangladesh. The main objective was to support the government's poverty reduction efforts by increasing sustainable agricultural and fishery production as well as income for smallholder farmers.

The project was successful in several ways. First, it generated 10 million person days of employment for the local inhabitants, which totalled some $12 million in extra income. It also resulted in higher agricultural production and crop diversity; in one area, production of cereal and non-cereal crops increased by as much as 25 percent from 1999 to 2000. Such higher production not only increased the incomes for smallholder farms, but also raised the demand for labourers — thus increasing their wage rate and changing the land tenure pattern. Opportunities for fisheries have also increased, with the landless benefiting especially because they have been allowed to lease government-controlled water bodies. Ultimately, as a result of the project, there was significant progress in human development in the area. The project has had positive impact on literacy, school enrolment and attendance rates

In addition to these achievements, this project was unique in its efforts to empower disadvantaged women. The project made it a priority to include women residents, along with the men, in its development and implementation process. Women were also targeted for inclusion in the labour force and were provided specific income-generating opportunities as well as skills development and microcredit programmes. These efforts ensured that previously marginalized women were better able to take advantage of the new opportunities arising from improved water infrastructure and thus to enhance their social and economic status.

*Source : Rahman, Atiur et. al. "Infrastructure and Poverty Reduction in Bangladesh," Report prepared for the Japan-UNDP Project on Infrastructure and Poverty Reduction, New York, 2005.*

tural production and sale. On the other hand, lack of market information and knowledge results in farmers becoming passive actors who fail to realize the full value of their production and are exploited by market forces. Poor or non-existent roads and information systems limit market access and restrict opportunities for income generation by restricting marketing opportunities, reducing returns to labour and capital, and increasing input costs such as transportation. Transport costs and storage constraints are particularly relevant for women, who tend to trade locally in vegetables and other perishables. Due to the lack of transportation to urban markets and an inability to conserve produce for later sale, they are usually faced with massive oversupply in the local markets in the dry season.

In Africa especially, road quality is of particular concern. Even where roads do exist, they are often in poor condition. Improved rural roads facilitate market access not only for the rural poor but also for urban producers and consumers. Good roads encourage diversification in village economies by opening up the market for labour and other products. They also facilitate other service provisions; For example, improved roads and transportation systems in Bangladesh and Nepal led to an influx of education and health services. In parts of Bhutan, access to markets has improved in areas where better roads have been built, Farmers in these areas responded by increasing their use of inputs, credit and improved agricultural practices. They and their families also have better access to health and education services.

In general, removing barriers to adequate service provision in rural areas will likely lead to improvements in agricultural productivity and diversification. These improvements will positively impact LDCs' overall development and economic viability.

**HIV/AIDS in capacity-constrained contexts**. In less than three decades, HIV/AIDS has grown to be one of the world's biggest social, economic and development challenges. The pandemic affects all levels of society, deepening levels of poverty and threatening to reverse years of development achievements. By the end of 2004, an estimated 39 million adults and children were living with HIV/AIDS worldwide. In that same year, about five million people became infected with HIV and more than three million died of AIDS.[106]

**The loss of human resources as a result of HIV/AIDS greatly limits the effectiveness of the public administration and other state institutions.**

The loss of human resources as a result of HIV/AIDS greatly limits the effectiveness of the public administration and other state institutions. Deaths related to HIV/AIDS have been the main cause of a decline in civil service employees in many LDCs. Service providers who fall sick or die are extremely hard to replace, especially in Africa, given the limited human capacity. For example, in Malawi up to 25 percent of the civil service was expected to experience either severe illness or death from HIV/AIDS during the period from 1995 to 2005. More than 30 percent of current teachers in Malawi are thought to be infected; overall, an estimated 860,000 children in Africa lost a teacher due to AIDS in 1999. As a result, these countries fail to secure the transfer of knowledge and know-how to the next generation, thus limiting individual and society-wide potential for development.

Attrition and weakened capacity resulting from HIV/AIDS have a disproportionate impact in the health sector. As a result of staff losses and absenteeism caused by sickness and death, a large part of care is provided at home by women and girls who are not sufficiently supported by the formal health care system. Many individuals and families affected by HIV/AIDS are forced to pay most of their health expenditure from their personal

[106] UNAIDS, *2004 Report on the Global AIDS Epidemic*, Geneva, June 2004.

assets. In a majority of LDCs in sub-Saharan Africa, home to several of the world's highest HIV prevalence countries, out-of-pocket expenditure can reach above 35 percent of total health expenditure. This is of particular concern given the incidences of low income, high poverty and increased health expenditure among many of the families in these countries.

High levels of stress, burnout, frustration and other work-related psychological effects negatively affect staff morale, resulting in a decline in productivity, individual staff performance, and quality and demand of service provision. Demand for services also declines as AIDS results in an increased number of orphans who cannot afford to go to school or to seek medical help. Young girls are disproportionately affected as they are more likely to be forced by families and communities to leave school and support family needs.

Success in strengthening human and institutional capacity to effectively provide basic services and respond to the epidemic relies both on effective governance — including the management of national and international resources — and on strengthened partnership among the State, private sector and civil society. Service delivery in the context of HIV/AIDS has been most successful when strong political commitment and leadership have focused on community mobilization and participation, thus placing HIV/AIDS concerns at the centre of the larger development agenda. Box 2.7 highlights some of the successful examples of service delivery in the context of HIV/AIDS.

**The epidemic diminishes domestic financial resource mobilization in LDCs, particularly for the high prevalence LDCs in Africa**

The epidemic diminishes domestic financial resource mobilization in LDCs, particularly for the high prevalence LDCs in Africa. The financial costs of replacing deceased employees, holding funerals, paying death benefits and providing care and support for sick civil servants further deplete the public-sector budget. Fortunately, in recent years, there has been an unprecedented increase in global financial resources directed at these costs. By 2003, available funds for the global HIV/AIDS response increased from $300 million in 1996 to an estimated $4.7 billion. The figure included increased funding from country governments as well as out-of-pocket spending by directly affected individuals and families. However, most observers agree that this amount is still less than half of what is needed by 2005, and only a quarter of what will be required in 2007. At the 2001 Abuja summit, member countries of the Organization of African Unity pledged to increase health expenditure to 15 percent of their national budgets. Presently, only Chad, the Central African Republic, Mozambique, Uganda and the United Republic of Tanzania have met that target. Given that access to health services is a universal human right, the State needs to bear the responsibility to provide that service, especially for poor and marginalized groups who are most vulnerable to sickness and least capable of coping with the added cost on their own. In some LDCs, at least one third of the health expenditure is funded by external resources. Similarly, less than half of governments in LDCs provide 50 percent or more of the total health expenditure.

Even where adequate funding is available, serious bottlenecks to effective disbursement of funds hamper the response. Capacity development efforts at both the national and international levels have focused on improving institutional mechanisms to transfer funds quickly from national to local and community levels; strengthening accounting and auditing mechanisms; and harmonizing bureaucratic funding processes.

**Conflicts that threaten institutional stability and service delivery.** As Rawan Farhadi, the Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Afghanistan to United Nations, pointed out in 2005, "The most important problem in LDCs, especially in

## Box 2.7. Selected success stories of service delivery in HIV/AIDS situations

At the end of 2003, approximately 61,000 adults and children in Nepal were living with HIV. Despite the relatively low HIV prevalence (0.5 percent) among the general population, prevalence among commercial sex workers was 17 percent. Recognizing the potential threat posed by this high rate, the Ministry of Defense and Home Affairs integrated HIV/AIDS issues in the training curricula for Nepalese soldiers and police officers. Currently, the army and the police are working with the National Centre for AIDS and STD control in developing training materials. With 7,000 new police and army recruits per year, the programme will reach between 35,000 and 40,000 people over the next five years. HIV/AIDS was also integrated into two programmes of the Ministry of Population and Environment.

With approximately 920,000 people living with HIV at the end of 2003, one of Zambia's most pressing priorities was to mainstream HIV/AIDS issues into all government sectors. To do this, the government began training Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives staff to encourage them to incorporate HIV/AIDS into their work. The training emphasizes the epidemic's role in eroding food security and the ways in which this negative impact can be mitigated through labour-saving technologies and practices. It also focuses on preserving knowledge, enhancing gender equality, improving nutrition and promotion of food and economic safety nets. Similarly, taking into consideration that one of the main prevention tools against HIV/AIDS is education, the Zambian Ministry of Education works with the Ministry of Community Development to identify children who need subsidies to increase the likelihood that they will attend school. To that end, the government has been using ICTs in innovative and inspiring ways. For example, the Interactive Radio Initiative has proved that learning can take place outside of traditional school buildings; with help of radios that act as teachers, children in vulnerable areas routinely outperform their counterparts in conventional schools.

*Sources: "Supporting Africa's Efforts to Achieve Sustainable Development: Dialogues at the Economic and Social Council," ECOSOC, 2002, p. 121-122; "Results: HIV/AIDS and UNDP: Regional Report on HIV/AIDS," UNDP, 2004; "Facing the Future Together: Report of the Secretary-General's Task Force on Women, Girls and HIV/AIDS in Southern Africa," UNAIDS; "2004 Report on the Global AIDS Epidemic," UNAIDS, 2004; "Striving for Good Governance in Africa: Synopsis of the 2005 African Governance Report," Economic Commission for Africa, 2004; "Cultural Diversity in Today's Diverse World," UNDP Human Development Report, 2004.*

countries emerging from conflict, is infrastructure and capacity-building."[107] From an institutional perspective, Farhadi added, "The lack of capacity on the part of state institutions to constitute and sustain themselves along democratic principles or to undertake key functions of ensuring peace and physical security, upholding the rule of law, delivering basic services or protecting human rights are all factors that contribute to the outbreak of conflicts."

In particular, prolonged and generalized conflicts can cause public administrations to collapse. The State becomes unable to tax and collect revenue, thus losing financial capacity along with human resources to provide public goods such as health care, education and security. War, accompanied by large-scale population movements, contributes to dramatic and differentiated declines in health and education sector functions and delivery. Insecurity leads to the closure of urban and rural health clinics, the displacement of staff and the disruption of social service programmes. For example, in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, years of conflict have exacerbated weak state capac-

[107] Farhadi's comments were made at a briefing on governance among LDCs Ambassadors, jointly organized by UNDP and UN-OHRLLS, that was held in New York on 26 September 2005.

ity and led to the collapse of the central administrative State, which precipitated a halt in salary payments to most employees outside the capital. In such conflict situations, the lack of both salary and physical safety prompts many civil servants to leave their country of their origin, thereby further weakening state institutions.[108]

Another potential problem in post-conflict countries is the predominance of the executive. In the early years after a conflict ends, this predominance may be appropriate and necessary. For example, in Timor-Leste, a strong Office of the President is seen as an important part of the democracy's ongoing maturation process. Without such support, and with a Parliament that is still weak and inexperienced, there is a risk that the executive government will continue to play a pre-dominant role in national politics.[109] At the same time, however, there is a risk that executive predominance will become entrenched for the long-term, which can have serious consequences for the development of an equitable society.

But state capacity can also be underestimated. As mentioned elsewhere in this Report, local capacities always exist, regardless of how weakened they may be in conflict situations. For example, a World Bank report on Afghanistan mentioned that "despite many deficiencies, what is perhaps surprising is that the administrative structure of the State as it currently exists is far more robust and functional than anyone had expected."[110] In Timor-Leste, community-based rules enforced by the "*liurai*" (traditional chiefs) were part of the traditional system of law, which persisted during the transition period after the collapse of the Indonesian-funded local administration. In both countries, certain key processes and structures that were in place before the conflict survived and continue to be used despite personnel, resource and telecommunications shortages. This suggests that even in conflict situations, there may be useful platforms of common understandings and discipline on which present and future reforms might be built.

**even in conflict situations, there may be useful platforms of common understandings and discipline on which present and future reforms might be built**

During periods of conflict, combatants often target basic infrastructure such as roads, schools and hospitals, which in turn limits the State's ability to provide basic social service. Conflict also generally results in a rise in military spending, which usually takes place against the background of diminishing tax revenues and GDP. For example, enduring conflicts in Eritrea and southern Sudan slowly drained national economies' ability to raise revenue and GDP through tax collection, trade and economic growth. Similarly, Chad and Mozambique, during their conflict years, experienced a dramatic decline in tax revenue due to both decline in taxable production and the administrative capacity to collect tax.[111] Military expenditure as compared with health and education expenditures as percentage of GDP still remains high for several LDCs. This translates into corresponding reductions in social service budgets and entitlements for the poor.

In LDCs, individuals residing in refugee camps and internally displaced people are also of special concern because they intensify pressure on fragile social and environmental resources in both countries of origin and host countries. In most refugee camps, lack of

[108] Robin Luckham, Ismael Ahmed, Robert White and Sarah Muggah, 'Conflict and Poverty in Sub-Saharan Africa: an Assessment of the Issues and Evidence," [IDS Working Paper 128], Institute of Development Studies, 2001.

[109] UNDP, "Assessment of capacity development efforts and outline of a framework for future UNDP support to Public Sector Management," UNDP Regional Centre in Bangkok, August 2005.

[110] World Bank, "Assessing Subnational Administration in Afghanistan: Early Observations and Recommendations for Action,", Working draft, Washington DC, 2003.

[111] Robin Luckham, op cit.

water and sanitation, in addition to inadequate health and education services, contribute to widespread incidence of disease and illness, sometimes reaching near epidemic proportions. The collapse of health services affects women more than men because of their need for reproductive and maternal health care. In addition, sexual violence, within and outside of refugee camps, creates additional gender-specific health problems. Sexual violence leads to an increase in sexually transmitted diseases (STDs) and HIV/AIDS, which are even harder to address from a health provision perspective in a conflict or refugee camp context.

The service-delivery challenges that arise during conflict do not immediately disappear with the end of war. Because resource gaps are still significant, post-conflict LDCs often depend on extensive amounts of external assistance in reconstruction. Immediate service delivery in post-conflict situations focuses on providing humanitarian relief such as food, medicine, shelter and repatriation without attempting to build capacity or accountability of service providers to users. Primary institutional rehabilitation efforts address issues of state building, securing the State's sole legitimacy for the use of violence, maintaining rule of law, and stabilizing the economic and political environment. These efforts are complicated by large numbers of refugees and internally displaced peoples, continuing civil disorder, ruined infrastructure, small and resource-starved industrial and service sectors; corruption; and poor data-collection capabilities.

**Because resource gaps are still significant, post-conflict LDCs often depend on extensive amounts of external assistance in reconstruction**

It is important to point out that, somewhat counterintuitively, aggregate social indicators for a country sometimes may actually improve during conflict years if the conflict is contained within a specific region. Such aggregate data can often hide the fact that development has significantly worsened in conflict-ridden areas. In Sudan, for example, aggregate social indicators registered improvement during the period of conflict even though southern Sudan was wracked with a war that destroyed its economy and largely eliminated any access to social services. Overall for the country, infant mortality fell from 102 per 1,000 live births in 1991 to 73 in 1996. Education, health and other social services also improved, with the human development index rising between 1987 and 1995.[112] In the southern part of the country, meanwhile, less than 25 percent of public schools and institutes open in 1983 continued to operate in 1998.

**Threats to environmental sustainability.** In many LDCs, environmental management is a critical concern. There are three key environmental issues that affect the lives of people, particularly poor people, in these countries. The first is related to the ownership of natural resources and the issue of community commons; the second is access of people to natural resources; and the third concerns environmental degradation and environmental regeneration.

Poor people suffer the most from poor environmental management and information. With the monetization of the economy, most communal assets such as community forests, ponds and grazing lands have disappeared, thus restricting poor people's access to traditional livelihoods, medicine sources and other benefits. They face additional setbacks based on lack of land ownership or legal rights to natural resources. Furthermore, it is often the case that poor people, because of poverty and lack of knowledge, are prone to unsustainable use of the resources available to them (e.g., through over cultivation of the land and poor water conservation practices). Finally, there is a strong gender dimension to the environment-poverty relationship. Girls and women, for example, constitute

[112] Ibid.

the majority of the nearly two million people who die each year from indoor air pollution.

In LDCs, the willingness and capacity of the State to deal with environmental issues are often limited by the realities on the ground. To start with, most environmental concerns in LDCs are basically poor persons' concerns — including soil erosion and salinization (which harms agriculture), deforestation and biodiversity loss, indoor air pollution and water contamination. There is thus no strong lobby within the government machinery to push forward the environmental agenda. Second, in many cases powerful multinational corporations are involved in plantation agriculture, in forestry or extraction activities and in the industrial sector, all activities that can degrade the environment if not regulated effectively. The governments of many LDCs do not have the capacity to apply or enforce environmental standards, however. Third, in terms of policy priorities the environment is still treated as an add-on to core macroeconomic policies. The environment ministry in most LDCs has little power or influence in comparison with ministries of finance and planning, for example; both the human and the financial resources available to environmental issues therefore are rather limited. LDCs are constrained not only within the national contexts, but also in global ones when environmental issues like acid rain and global warming are discussed.

**LDCs are constrained not only within the national contexts, but also in global ones when environmental issues like acid rain and global warming are discussed**

Since the World Summit on Sustainable Development in 1992, many developing countries, including LDCs, have developed environment action plans. The LDCs Fund of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) supports the enhancement of LDCs' adaptive capacity and the implementation of their national adaptation plans of actions (NAPAs). It also provides grants in six areas: biodiversity, climate change, international waters, land degradation, the ozone layer and persistent organic pollutants. All but 2 of the 50 LDCs have had regular access to GEF funds for national capacity self-assessments, country programmes, capacity-building and enabling activities. This kind of assistance is helping many LDCs in their efforts to achieve the seventh MDG (on environmental sustainability).

**Natural disaster risks.** According to a UNDP report from 2004, "Natural disasters exert an enormous toll on development. They pose a significant threat to prospects for achieving the MDGs, in particular the overarching target of halving extreme poverty by 2015. Annual economic losses associated with such disasters averaged $75.5 billion in the 1960s, $138.4 billion in the 1970s, $213.9 billion in the 1980s and $659.9 billion in the 1990s. The majority of these losses is concentrated in the developed world and fails to adequately capture the impact of the disaster on the poor who often bear the greatest cost in terms of lives and livelihoods, and rebuilding their shattered communities and infrastructure. Today, 85 percent of the people exposed to earthquakes, tropical cyclones, floods and droughts live in countries having either medium or low human development."[113]

Among other causes, rapid urbanization and rural poverty are partially responsible for creating new disaster risks and exacerbating existing ones. The growth of informal settlements and inner city slums in cities has led to the growth of unstable urban living environments. These settlements are often located in ravines, on steep slopes, along flood plains or adjacent to noxious or dangerous industrial or transport facilities. Similarly, rural poverty is one of the key factors that shape risk to hazards such as a flooding or drought. Often, the poorest in a rural area occupy the most marginal lands. They eke out precari-

[113] UNDP, "Reducing Disaster Risk: A Challenge for Development," 2004.

ous livelihoods in areas prone to drought, flooding and other hazards. Local ecological and environmental change as a consequence of agricultural practices can itself create risk.

The lack of capacity to manage and adapt to climate-related risks is a central development issue in LDCs, particularly for the small island States. Although the world's developed nations produce the majority of greenhouse gases, the burden of impact from climate change will undoubtedly be more severe in low income countries because a far larger share of their populations live in vulnerable environments (such as low-lying coastal areas, as in Bangladesh) and, furthermore, such countries have fewer resources to allocate toward preparedness and relief services. In addition, national economies in LDCs are more frequently dependent on agricultural production, which is severely affected by natural disasters.

As witnessed with the Asian tsunami in December 2004, natural disasters can directly set back LDCs' efforts to move ahead in global development indicators. As a result of its impressive economic and human development achievements, Maldives was due to graduate from the ranks of LDCs, only the second country that would have been able to do so since the establishment of the LDC group in 1971. The force of the tsunami waves that struck the island group on 26 December caused widespread infrastructure devastation in the low-lying atolls. Even though fewer than 100 lives were lost, Maldives was among the worst affected countries. Nearly a third of its almost 300,000 people lost

## Box 2.8. Mozambique: Evolution of a disaster management structure

Mozambique has a fairly developed formal disaster management and risk reduction system, the evolution of which dates to the 1980s. In September 1980, the Government of Mozambique created the Coordinating Council for Prevention and Combat of Natural Disasters to address disaster prevention and the mitigation of natural disasters. This body's primary responsibilities during its early years, from 1982–1994, were to provide emergency response and relief. During most of that time the country was convulsed with a civil war.

In 1992, following the Rome Peace Accord, the Government of Mozambique began to shift its emphasis in disaster management from immediate response to long-term mitigation and risk reduction. In 1996 a process, supported by the World Food Programme, was initiated to formulate a coherent national policy on disaster management. In 1999 the national Disaster Management Policy was approved, and the National Institute for Disaster Management (INGC). The INGC serves as the government's permanent technical unit and is mandated to develop policies and coordinate disaster management as well as recommend disaster management legislation or ratification of international agreements, employ personnel and enter into contracts on behalf of the INGC.

While Mozambique has a fairly elaborated disaster management structure, the system has a number of weaknesses. It is still highly centralized at the national level. Decentralization, especially to the district level, has not been a priority, with the result that structures at provincial levels lack operational and human resources capacity. There are also inadequate human resources and capacities at the central level indicated by high levels of vacancies at managerial levels in the INGC headquarters. The INGC also has a limited budget, with funds allocated only for operational costs. Information management is still weak and the INGC is also constrained in exercising its authority as a coordinating mechanism because of the lack of an enabling act.

*Source: "A Global Review: UNDP Support to Institutional and Legislative Systems for Disaster Risk Management," UNDP, Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery, 2005*

homes or businesses. The impact on the national economy, which is mostly supported by tourism, fishery and agriculture, has been substantive. About one tenth of the 200 inhabited islands experienced extensive devastation, and 14 had to be evacuated. Given the economic impact of the disaster, Maldives will for now maintain its LDC status.

**it is increasingly apparent that establishing a framework for management and mitigation of disasters and hazards should be a vital part of state capacity**

The development community continues to view disasters as exceptional natural events that interrupt normal development; the general thinking is that these events can be managed solely through humanitarian actions. However, it is increasingly apparent that establishing a framework for management and mitigation of disasters and hazards should be a vital part of state capacity. Capacity development efforts focused on institutional and legal arrangements for preparedness; relief services; data collection; and dissemination of information for early warnings and best practices can play a significant part in reducing the negative impact of natural disasters. Therefore, what is now required is the political will to reorient relevant state and non-state actors so that considerations for natural disasters are incorporated in the overall development agenda of a country, especially if it is prone to natural disasters.

The creation of a comprehensive disaster risk management (DRM) structure requires time and experience. Many LDCs have gone through the processes of creating or updating legislation, policies and plans that will establish a comprehensive DRM structure and the follow-up to such processes. In others, though, this is still an ongoing task (see Box 2.8). Follow-up has been negatively affected by waning political support and engagement, a lack of consultation with and participation of local level actors and a lack of awareness among the general public. In some cases, processes have been interrupted by political instability or internal conflict. Even though disaster risk management can bring communities closer together, little or no attention has yet been paid to the potential of disaster management as a tool for conflict prevention initiatives, despite some encouraging experiences.

CHAPTER THREE

# Non-state actors

## Introduction

State capacity in LDCs is constrained by many economic, institutional and geographical factors. Therefore, non-state actors — communities, civil society, the private sector and external development partners — have a critical role to play in democratic governance and in addressing development challenges. This role is anchored in two premises. First, non-state actors are important partners of the State in the promotion of democratic governance and development. State and non-state partnerships and interactions increase the likelihood that a government is more responsive, transparent and accountable to all members of society. Moreover, these interactions and partnerships can improve democratic practice by facilitating people's participation in politics and decision-making process, empowering local groups to take charge of their livelihoods, and allowing citizens to advocate for policy reforms with public officials and political figures. Both the MDGs and the BPoA recognize that overcoming development challenges requires the existence of constant and efficient linkages among governments and all members of society. This in turn requires the existence of an inclusive and engaged society that incorporates the voice of all groups in decision-making processes and promotes people-centred development policies.

**just like the government institutions that they seek to improve, non-state actors themselves need to be subject to the same principles of transparency, accountability and inclusiveness.**

Second, apart from partnerships with the State, non-state actors by themselves can contribute significantly to addressing development challenges of LDCs by, among other things, bringing in alternative voices to policy debates and dialogues, providing service delivery and acting as a watch dog for state activities. Nonetheless, just like the government institutions that they seek to improve, non-state actors themselves need to be subject to the same principles of transparency, accountability and inclusiveness.

This chapter analyzes the role of non-state actors in democratic governance and in addressing development challenges in LDCs. It starts by assessing civil society's contributions to various aspects of democratic governance. While acknowledging the important role of civil society in addressing governance challenges, this chapter also stresses that civil society has its own limitations and is thus not a development panacea. Sections of this chapter are devoted to a review of civil society's achievements in policy formulation and service delivery; the role of the private sector and public-private partnerships in addressing development challenges of LDCs; and interaction between civil society and external development partners.

## Civil society contributions to democratic governance in LDCs

Democratic governance requires the existence of constant and efficient linkages among governments and all members of society. Civil society is distinct from society in general since it refers to people organizing and acting together in the public sphere to attain collective goals, express shared ideas and views, exchange information, and improve the functioning of state institutions and make them more accountable, among many other functions.[114] Civil society provides a space for state institutions and members of society to consult with each other, interact, and exchange views and information on public mat-

[114] Larry Diamond, "Civil Society" in *Developing Democracy: Toward Consolidation.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999.

ters. It also creates institutional spaces for the active participation of minorities and vulnerable groups in decision-making processes and for increasing political representation of the views and interests of such groups in state institutions.

It is important to emphasize that civil society is not a homogenous group; it encompasses a broad range of formal and informal organizations, associations and social movements. Community-based organizations, NGOs, charities, voluntary organizations and trade unions are all part of civil society. This intrinsic diversity in origin and ideas is one of civil society's main contributions to democratic governance. Contributions from civil society vary across countries depending on the development stage of the civil society organizations and individual countries' needs and openness to their involvement.

### Civic participation and parliamentary development

Civil society in many LDCs has been successful in helping enhance civic participation in democratic governance. In many instances, civil society has created awareness about participating in elections, raised issues for election manifestoes, and initiated debates and discussions on issues of public concerns. It has also played a significant role in voter education programmes, particularly among minorities, young and first-time voters, women and indigenous groups (see table 3.1). Citizen education programmes have resulted in higher voter turnout in many LDCs (see Box 3.1). In several instances, civil society groups have served as election observers. The role of civil society has been apparent during broad-based dialogues on PRSPs and debt issues in several LDCs.

**Table 3.1. Voter education programmes for minorities and other groups in selected LDCs**

Special voter education programmes for targeted groups and individuals were developed during these LDCs' most recent national elections

| | People with disabilities | Young people/ first-time voters | Women | Ethnic minorities | Indigenous groups | Illiterate people | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Bangladesh | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No |
| Burkina Faso | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes |
| Cambodia | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No |
| Lesotho | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | No |
| Mozambique | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | No |
| Nepal | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | No |
| Uganda | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No |

*Source: Election Process Information Collection (EPIC), "EPIC Comparative Analysis: Voter Education" http://epicproject.org/ace/compepic/en/VE06.*

Media, another stakeholder in development that is most effective when independent from government control, has come to play an important role in enabling society to promote democratic governance. As the political space has become more inclusive, information has also become more readily accessible in LDCs. The media has initiated civic education programmes designed to help increase citizens' knowledge and awareness of their rights and responsibilities and to promote an informed and participatory civil society. Moreover, at least in LDCs where political transitions are under way, there is some evidence that information is becoming decentralized and more freely disseminated.

## Box 3.1. Citizen education programme in Zambia

In the early 1990s in Zambia, two NGOs and a group of officials and teachers from the Ministry of Education launched a variety of civic education programmes with the objective of raising political awareness and stimulating civic action among Zambian citizens. The programmes included workshops on civil and political rights that provided training to trainers who would then facilitate grassroots workshops; the creation of a new course syllabus for civic education in secondary schools; and innovative, unconventional civic education awareness-raising programmes such as drama, public discussions, media spots, walks, concerts and video shows.

National surveys and other follow-ups to the programmes subsequently revealed that the civic education activities had a significant impact on civic knowledge, the promotion of civic values and skill, the expression of political preferences and civic action (notably voting). For the 1996 elections, 86 percent of the programme participants registered to vote, compared with the national average of 60 percent. It should be noted, however, that the programmes only had limited success with poor people and marginalized sections of the population. Due to a combination of low education/literacy and lack of access to the media, many of these individuals seemed to be less receptive to the methods used in the programme.

*Source: Bratto, M. and Aldfelder, P., "The Effects of Civic Education on Political Culture: Evidence from Zambia," World Development, Vol. 27, No.5, 1999.*

In LDCs of eastern and southern African, for instance, independent media is increasingly common as more multiparty regimes have been established[115]. In West Africa, there are many private, commercially oriented media outlets that provide a significant source of public information on health, education and community initiatives. In South-East Asia, on the other hand, the communications industry remains mainly under government control; in a number of countries in that region, press freedom has been eroded by politics and the government's response to persistent violence. As a result, ambiguity and caution prevail, and individual journalists generally censor their own stories according to their perceptions of the government's sensitivities.[116]

While political transitions generally have spurred greater media freedom, multiparty electoral processes have also had negative impacts on the media in some countries where increased political pressure has resulted in greater government control of media outlets and information. In many emerging democracies, there has been a tendency to continue to use the media to support the ruling elite based on concerns that inviting critical analysis would threaten national unity. Supporters of tight government control argue that independent media and strong opposition parties and groups will foment unrest and generate political instability.

Civil society in LDCs has been instrumental in mobilizing public opinion and raising public awareness about MDGs.[117] Many civil society organizations have generated broad-based mobilization and created increasing demand for accountability on the part

[115] Wisdom Tettey, "The Media, Accountability and Civil Engagement in Africa," HDR Background Paper, 2002.

[116] Waseem Mahmood, "Policy Analysis of Electronic Media Practices in South Asia: A Comparative Study," Birmingham, UK, UNDP and, Baltic Media Centre, 2001, pp. 20-21.

[117] See Susan Alexander, "The Role of the Media in Attaining the MDGs," *Development* 48, No. 1, 2005, pp. 129-131; Roberto Bissio, "Civil Society and the MDGs," *Development Policy Journal* , No. 3, 2003, pp. 151-160; United Nations, "NGOs Assess the Millennium Development Goals," *NGLS Roundup*, No. 105, 2003, pp. 1-6.

of decision makers, a situation that is essential for introducing MDGs into the public debate and policy-making.[118] The role of civil society organizations has been crucial not only in campaigning for the goals at the local level, but also in monitoring progress and sustaining public interest.

The rise in multi-partisanship in LDCs has led to expanded powers and roles for parliamentary bodies. Following multiparty elections, capacity development assistance has been directed to develop constitutional provisions that acknowledge the role of parliaments not only as an effective check on the power of the executive, but also as an important mechanism to increase the inclusion and representation of minorities and vulnerable groups in public matters. As a result, many LDCs have constitutional commitments to make state institutions more representative of the national social profile. However, significant challenges remain before parliaments in many LDCs fully realize their democratic governance roles; these challenges include executive dominance, weak civil society or other representative institutions, and historical ethnic tensions and exclusions.

Civic engagement with legislators and citizen participation in legislative processes — including efforts aimed at increasing citizens' understanding of the role of the parliament or how to access their elected representatives — remain limited across LDCs. Instead, civic education has focused more on voter education and supporting legislators to understand and exercise their representative roles. As a result, although legislators' relationship with civil society often has been tenuous in the past, more parliaments in LDCs are finding ways to work constructively with civil society and to create opportunities for people's engagement in the policy-making process.[119] The conditions in LDCs have often hampered representation, particularly where there are large physical distances between legislators and their constituents, such as in the Pacific LDCs.[120] Institutional and infrastructural limitations to interaction between electors and their representatives have also contributed to the lack of representation in many LDCs' parliaments.

Communication is also improving in the other direction. Parliaments in LDCs are increasingly aware of the importance of helping civil society organizations better understand their role through dissemination of information about the work of the parliament. In Mozambique, technical support has resulted in materials that aim to inform civil society organizations about legislative events and processes such as how a bill becomes a law and what occurs at parliamentary plenary and committee events.[121]

A number of parliaments have also played critical roles in post-conflict settings by bringing together and fostering dialogue among different parties to the conflict and restoring the rule of law. In such situations, parliaments can serve as a forum for starting a new political culture and dialogue between opposing parties, which promotes the participation of civil society in government and ensures the State's accountability to citizens' needs. In Burundi and Rwanda, the parliaments were essential to recent peace processes because they provided a forum for the warring parties to engage in dialogue and established a framework for restoring the rules of engagement.[122]

**A number of parliaments have also played critical roles in post-conflict settings by bringing together and fostering dialogue among different parties**

[118] Carol Barton, Martin Khor, Sunita Narain and Victoria Tauli-Corpuz, *Civil Society Perspectives on the Millennium Development Goals*, New York, United Nations, 2005.

[119] UNDP and IPU, *Ten Years of Strengthening Parliaments in Africa, 1991-2000*, 2003, p. 65.

[120] See John K. Johnson and Robert Nakamura, "Concept Paper on Legislatures and Good Governance," 1999.

[121] Ibid.

[122] UNDP and IPU, "Ten Years of Strengthening Parliaments in Africa, 1991-2000," 2003, p. 4.

### Civil society and political parties

Political parties play a vital role in democratic governance: No democratic system can function without alternative parties and candidates. Political parties are crucial in aggregating interests, presenting political alternatives to citizens, nominating candidates and linking voters with elected public officials. Moreover, political parties can play a central role in generating cadres of leaders who promote democratic governance principles and monitor elected representatives. Additionally, once their members have been elected, political parties can have influence in shaping public policy. They secure resources, create support among different political forces, and orient government around specific issues and platforms.[123] Despite the fact that political parties may fall short when facing the complexities of national realities, no democratic system can ignore them and efforts should be made to make political parties efficient, inclusive and accountable institutions.

Political parties are often perceived negatively by the population, which may consider them largely inefficient, corrupt and unaccountable.[124] This situation is even more acute in LDCs, where there is usually no tradition of multi-party government and little or no effort or resources have been devoted to improving the quality and reach of existing parties. Often, political parties are viewed as driven by personal politics and out of touch with the main concerns of society. Among the common criticisms of political parties are that they do not have clear internal procedures to democratically select candidates; fail to give women and minorities a strong role in the party; and overlook the importance of incorporating young people in the party ranks.

**A healthy and balanced relationship between civil society and political parties is essential for democratic governance.**

A healthy and balanced relationship between civil society and political parties is essential for democratic governance. This relationship is not always easy to establish or maintain, however. In some countries, there is persistent confrontation among civil society organizations and political parties; in others, meanwhile, it is hard to distinguish between the two entities because civil society organizations play important political roles and are clear allies of political parties. The latter situation is not necessarily a positive development, however, because conflicts of interest can arise when the balance goes out of control. "The real challenge is to balance support for democratic institutions and organizations that are more accountable and inclusive, while at the same time continuing to foster and nurture the development of a broadly based and active civil society."[125]

### Ensuring state transparency and accountability — a watchdog role of civil society

One of the most important functions of civil society is to provide checks and balances to government power. In this context, civil society serves as the watchdog of democratic institutions, helping ensure that they are accountable to their constituencies. Civil society promotes state accountability in many cases by empowering and making the State's checks and balances work efficiently. In other instances, where government mechanisms of accountability do not exist, civil society can exert pressure to create them in the first place. Civil society in this sense is not an adversary of the State, but instead serves to encourage it to improve and maintain its democratic nature. By exposing abuses of

[123] UNDP, "Handbook on Opportunities in Political Party Programming; UNDP Experiences and Perspectives," 2005, p. 8 [Draft]

[124] Ivan Doherty, "Democracy Out of Balance; Civil Society Can't Replace Political Parties," *Policy Review* , April/May 2001, p. 27.

[125] Ibid., p. 32.

power and government wrongdoings, increasing expectations of effective performance and creating political pressure, civil society can push state mechanisms to target corrupt, inefficient and unaccountable practices. However, in some cases, the capability of civil society to make the State accountable is constrained by restrictive laws. In such environments, civil society organizations focus on non-institutional tools like mass mobilization and media denunciations. The pressure they exert through such means may be more symbolic, but it is nevertheless important.

In the LDC context, organized civil society often advocates for the end of authoritarian regimes and one-party rule, and for the establishment of democratic processes and a multiparty political system. In many African LDCs, civil society organizations have helped increase state accountability to the citizenry by exposing and denouncing wrongdoings. In Benin, Chad and Malawi, for example, civil society actors have used the media to expose civil and political rights violations in an effort to restore or launch democracy in their countries. In Senegal, civil society members helped to oversee the election process and subsequently exposed instances of ballot stuffing and other irregularities, which hastened the government's commitment to prevent fraud and ensure transparency in the election process.[126]

**In many LDCs, civil society organizations have focused on monitoring budgets as part of an effort to increase state accountability and transparency**

In Bangladesh, civil society-organized mass mobilization campaigns helped re-establish democracy in 1991.[127] Since then, civil society organizations have played a critical watchdog function to help ensure state accountability. Twenty-five civil society organizations joined together to create the "Democracy Forum," which is also supported by Democracy Partnership Program of USAID, the Asia Foundation and the Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee (BRAC).[128] The goals of this forum are to improve the performance and accountability of local government; promote citizen advocacy; ensure free and fair elections; increase awareness of legal rights and women's rights; and promote the resolution of disputes through the local mediation proces.[129] This coalition of civil society actors works to increase the accountability of the State while encouraging the public to participate in its institutional framework.

In many LDCs, civil society organizations have focused on monitoring budgets as part of an effort to increase state accountability and transparency.[130] In Uganda, for example, budget monitoring has been brought to the grassroots level through the action of the Uganda Debt Network (UND), an NGO dedicated to promoting the inclusion of

[126] Wisdom Tettey, "The Media, Accountability and Civil Engagement in Africa," HDR Background Paper, 2002, p. 6, p. 11.

[127] Habib Zafarullah and Mohammad Habibur Rahman, "Human Rights, Civil Society and Nongovernmental Organizations: The Nexus in Bangladesh," *Human Rights Quaterly*, Vol. 24, 2002, p. 1013.

[128] BRAC, formerly known as Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee, was established as a relief and rehabilitation organization in 1972. Over the years BRAC has gradually evolved into a large and multifaceted development organization with the twin objectives of alleviating poverty and empowering the poor. Online: www.brac.net.

[129] Habib Zafarullah and Mohammad Habibur Rahman, "Human Rights, Civil Society and Nongovernmental Organizations: The Nexus in Bangladesh," *Human Rights Quaterly*, Vol. 24, 2002, pp. 1030-1031

[130] See Kate Dyer and Chris Pain, "*Civil Society Budget Monitoring for National Accountability*," Workshop Report, 17–19 February 2004, Malawi, OXFAM GB; Jim Shultz, *Follow the Money: A Guide to Monitoring Budgets and Oil and Gas Revenues*, New York: Open Society Institute, 2005; The International Budget Project, "CSOs Examine Chad-Cameroon Pipeline Project and Chad Budget Process," The International Budget Project Newsletter, No. 26, March 2005.

## Box 3.2. Civil society in anti-corruption efforts: Initiative to monitor oil revenues in Chad

Although oil was discovered in Chad over 30 years ago, years of conflict and technical challenges prevented the country from exploiting it until recently. In 2000, the World Bank provided support for the construction of a pipeline to transport oil from Chad through Cameroon to the Atlantic Coast for export. The $4.2 billion Chad-Cameroon Petroleum Development and Pipeline Project represents not only the largest single private investment in sub-Saharan Africa today, but also a significant effort to promote poverty reduction through the targeted use of oil revenues.

The most innovative feature of the project was the establishment of a legal framework that assigns resources to poverty reduction expenditures and the creation of an oversight committee — the College for Control and Monitoring of Petroleum Resources — to ensure the transparent management of the country's oil wealth. The College is a joint government-civil society entity composed of four civil society representatives (one each from four distinct civil society groupings, including local NGOs, unions, human rights groups and religious groups), two national legislators, the head of the Central Bank, the director of the Treasury, and a member of the Supreme Court. The College has three main functions:

- monitor and ensure that oil revenues deposited in an offshore account correspond with the declared production, and the terms of the sales contract;
- ensure that the government allocates the oil revenues according to a law approved by Chad's Parliament that sets out the arrangements for the use of the revenues, with 10 percent of the royalties and revenues to be held in trust for future generations, 5 percent to be earmarked for regional development in the oil-producing area, and the bulk of the remaining 85 percent to be devoted to education, health, social services, rural development, infrastructure, environmental and water resource management; and
- approve the outlays — project by project — of the priority sector allocations, and verify that projects are satisfactorily executed.

In its short life, the College has made promising strides, acting with rigor and transparency despite challenges. Besides the members of the College, other local civil society organizations have mobilized to guarantee that oil revenues are directed towards poverty alleviation. Substantial effort is being made to strengthen participation in budget monitoring through budget literacy and budget advocacy tools at the local level.

The World Bank and civil society groups have expressed concerns with the proposed changes to the Petroleum Revenue Management Law presented to the National Assembly by the Chad Government at the end of 2005. The changes would significantly alter the current system for managing oil revenues, including abolishing the Fund for Future Generations, the primary poverty-reduction element. The proposed changes are seen by the government as a solution to the country's fiscal crisis, while the World Bank — the main partner of the Chad government in the oil pipeline project — is of the opinion that the changes will have a negative impact on development and poverty eradication in the longer run.

*Sources: Jim Shultz, Follow the Money: A Guide to Monitoring Budgets and Oil and Gas Revenues, New York: Open Society Institute, 2005, p. 33; The International Budget Project, "CSOs Examine Chad-Cameroon Pipeline Project and Chad Budget Process," The International Budget Project Newsletter, No. 26, March 2005; Ian Gary and Nikki Reisch, Chad's Oil: Miracle or Mirage?, Catholic Relief Service and Bank Information Center, 2005; Collège de Contrôle et de Surveillance des Ressources Pétrolières, "Report of Mission to Sites of Project Finance by Old Revenues," online: http://ccsrp-tchad.org/site/index2.cfm and www.worldbank.org/afr/ccproj.*

poor people's voices into the economic and political decision-making process.[131] By training volunteers in different areas, UND has developed a network of community monitors who measure service delivery and government initiatives to alleviate poverty. Although UND's work generated some friction in the beginning, over time community monitors and the local governments have become allies, "with officials seeing the project as a way to help track what they should be receiving from governments higher up and as a constructive vehicle for community input." [132] A similar effort is under way in Ghana, where the Integrated Social Development Centre created a Centre for Budget Advocacy to train civil society organizations to learn about local and national budgets and to engage in budget formulation in ways that promote democratic governance and accountability (see Box 3.2).[133]

Many civil society organizations encounter limitations and obstacles when monitoring budgets and the transparency of public policy processes. In many developing countries, government officials still consider the budget process to be too sensitive and important for inputs to be provided by civil society. Consequently, elected officials rarely discuss project proposals publicly or solicit opinions from constituents. Few if any needs assessments or planning discussions are held at the regional and local level, and often budget and procurement procedures are extremely long and complicated.[134] Budget monitoring is also complicated by the lack of available data, government distrust of citizens' involvement in budget advocacy and monitoring, and civil society organizations' substandard budget literacy. Nonetheless, important initiatives for strengthening citizen participation in budget monitoring and budget literacy are taking place in LDCs, many with the financial and technical support of international donors. A good example is the now widespread discipline of gender budgeting.

**Many civil society organizations encounter limitations and obstacles when monitoring budgets and the transparency of public policy processes**

### Civil society's role in communication, information dissemination and awareness building

An important element for the promotion and defence of human rights is the existence of "rights literacy" among the population. Civil society can play a substantial role in generating and disseminating knowledge about rights as well as documenting and denouncing abuse of those rights. In many Asian and African LDCs, for example, civil society organizations have led the way in raising visibility and awareness of the HIV/AIDS epidemic and fighting HIV-related stigma and discrimination.[135] These organizations help to bring a human rights-based approach to the battle against HIV/AIDS — one that seeks to reduce vulnerability by addressing root causes such as social exclusion, economic deprivation and discrimination.

Civil society in Asian LDCs has relied on the media to provide often hard to reach community members with access to information regarding health concerns such as SARS, avian flu and HIV/AIDS, and issues of environmental degradation. Such out-

[131] Jim Shultz, *Follow the Money: A Guide to Monitoring Budgets and Oil and Gas Revenues*, New York: Open Society Institute, 2005, p. 49.

[132] Ibid.

[133] UNDP, "Partners in Human Development: UNDP and Civil Society Organization," 2003, p. 26.

[134] The International Budget Project, "CSOs Examine Chad-Cameroon Pipeline Project and Chad Budget Process," International Budget Project Newsletter, No. 26, March 2005.

[135] See UNDP, "Partners in Human Development: UNDP and Civil Society Organization," 2003, pp. 67–77.

reach efforts encourage the circulation of ideas, the formation of a more inclusive civil society and the greater involvement of citizens in determining government policies. Mass media has thus been one of the primary tools in the fight against HIV/AIDS. Despite the sensitive nature of epidemic-related information, particularly in matters of sex and sexuality, mass media has utilized its tremendous potential for reaching widely divergent audiences, including youth, women and migrant workers, to increase awareness and prevention information.

Civil society has played a positive role in many processes of peace and reconciliation, providing the space for the circulation of information and government service provision.[136] In Sudan and Somalia, civil society organizations have organized symposiums and workshops addressing conflict resolution; met with national and local leaders in order to pressure them to engage in negotiations and bring an end to conflict; and demonstrated and disseminated their views through the media to engage citizens in calling for an end to war. These organizations have also developed plans to address post-conflict situations in their countries, notably in terms of resettling internally displaced peoples, initiating reconstruction, and increasing service delivery.[137]

Civil society organizations in conflict or post-conflict areas also have emphasized efforts to improve the situation of women through awareness campaigns focusing on the effects of war and strife on women and children, who are disproportionately affected by such turmoil. Women's networks have organized successful campaigns to disseminate information on gender-based violence, especially domestic violence. For example, in Rwanda, in the aftermath of the genocide, several new civil society organizations were launched to provide women with education; social, financial and psychosocial assistance; and access to services addressing gender-based and domestic violence, including legal aid for victims wishing to prosecute their attackers.[138] In Sierra Leone, another LDC that experienced extensive conflict recently, numerous local civil society organizations are committed to women's empowerment. These organizations work with the media to reduce stigma against women that results from gender-based violence, and to and create opportunities for the advancement of women's education, welfare and status. In Timor-Leste, local civil society initiatives have worked to educate and train the public about human rights with a particular focus on women's rights. In addition, many Timorese organizations offer women and girls access to information on sexuality and gender.

**The widespread availability of information and communications technology (ICT) tools... have contributed to a decline in government monopolies of information and opinion**

The widespread availability of information and communications technology (ICT) tools, including short-wave radios, satellite, television and fax machines (and, to a more limited degree, computers and the Internet), have contributed to a decline in government monopolies of information and opinion. Community radio has been critical in disseminating information and enhancing local governance in isolated and rural areas that public programming may not reach. In many LDCs' remote areas, there has been an increase in local language radio and community newsletters owned by indigenous groups and organizations (see Box 3.3).[139]

---

[136] Ibid., pp. 48-65.

[137] UNDP, "Arab Human Development Report 2004," 2005, p. 28.

[138] Jeanne Ward, *If Not Now, When? Addressing Gender-based Violence in Refugee, Internally Displaced, and Post-conflict Settings*, New York: The Reproductive Health for Refugees Consortium, 2002.

[139] Jeff Liew, "Traditional Strengths and Modern Technologies: Exploring and Building Synergy in the Pacific" in *Changing Policy and Practice from Below: Community Experiences in Poverty Reduction - An Examination of Nine Case-Studies*, ed. Anridh Krishna, New York, 2000, pp. 106-117.

## Box 3.3. People First Network: ICT for rural development in the Solomon Islands

The People First Network (PFNet) is an innovative grassroots project that promotes and facilitates equitable and sustainable rural development in a remote location through the improvement of information sharing and knowledge building among and across communities in the Solomon Islands. PFNet, run by the local NGO Rural Development Volunteers Association, consists of a network of solar powered e-mail stations in remote and rural locations that are connected to an Internet café in Honiara, the capital. E-mail messages are transmitted over high frequency radio waves, thereby providing isolated communities with access to affordable communication.

The active participation of rural communities in implementation and monitoring has been a central feature of the project. The establishment of the e-mail station was community driven, which ensured extensive participation in determining site location, organization and identification of local experts in villages. To lower barriers to the effective participation of women, the project selected women as a majority of station operators.

In the early stage of the project, to gain recognition and credibility, PFnet entered prestigious international competitions in the fields of ICT for development. The ensuing recognition contributed towards generating donor support and stakeholder confidence. PFnet began in March 2001 as pilot project with an Internet café and e-mail station; less than five years later there were 13 e-mail stations in use throughout the country, and the project is going to be replicated in Vanuatu.

PFnet facilitates business in rural communities by helping them in supplying stock, ordering cargo (for rural shops), receiving agricultural information, finding shipping schedules, and connecting with banks for financial transactions and with government offices in Honiara. Evaluations show that another common use of PFnet is for education. Furthermore, PFnet has become an important tool for doctors, nurses and health workers who use the network to communicate with each other regarding medical results of rural patients, diagnoses, advice on treatment and ordering medicines. Finally, the network has contributed to the dissemination of accurate information on relevant governance issues.

*Sources: www.peoplefirst.net.sb/; www.undp.org/rbap/BestPrac/FIJ_PFnet.pdf; www.peoplefirst.net.sb/Downloads/PFnet_JICA_USP_Research_Final_Report.pdf*

In African LDCs where illiteracy rates are high, the media has played a major role in the exchange of information and ideas, particularly in the context of the HIV/AIDS pandemic.[140] For example, in West Africa, community media outlets provide information on health and education in addition to entertainment.[141] In Mali, where the literacy rate is approximately 30 percent, there are 60 independent radio stations (one of which is the first radio station in Africa geared exclusively for women) as well as 40 independent newspapers. The radio stations educate the public regarding their civil and political rights, and 75 percent of men and 50 percent of women regard the radio as the main source of information on HIV/AIDS.[142]

Furthermore, the exchange of information and ideas among civil society actors can enhance peace building in post-conflict situations and play a critical role in preventing crisis recurrence. For example, Radio Kwizera (Hope), which serves the refugee camps

[140] IATT (UNAIDS Inter-agency Task Team on Education and HIV/AIDS), "Role of Education in the Protection, Care and Support of Orphans and Vulnerable Children Living in World with HIV and AIDS," 2004, p. 4.

[141] Pippa Norris and Dieter Zinnbauer, "Giving Voice to the Voiceless: Good Governance, Human Development and Mass Communication," HDR Background Paper for HDR 2002, p. 28.

[142] Ibid., p. 25.

on the Burundian/Rwandan border, provides public education (particularly regarding health) and aims to foster peace and reconciliation among refugees.[143]

Such important strides forward cannot disguise the fact that the media in many LDCs still faces challenges and constraints that seriously limit its impact in advancing democratic governance. Among the most common challenges are governments exercising control over the media; legal constraints on the provision or disclosure of official information; self-censorship by intimidated journalists; political or economic influences on media institutions (often related to their ownership); precarious finances of media organizations and limited financial resources; over-dependence on advertising sources that seek to gain influence over content; hostility of politicians and public servants toward the media and the disclosure of information; and lack of understanding of the importance to democratic institutions of an independent and free media.[144]

## Addressing economic and human development challenges in LDCs — civil society's role

The major two ways that civil society can contribute to addressing LDCs' economic and human development challenges are 1) by taking an active part in policy debates and dialogues, and thereby helping influencing policy formulation, and 2) by being an active partner in service delivery.

**State-civil society collaborative policy-making processes seem especially well suited to address a wide range of difficult and complex social issues such as the environment and sustainable development; crime and safety; discrimination and social justice; and poverty and social equity.**

### Influencing policy debates and policy formulation

Civil society promotes democratic governance by providing government policy makers with information on the needs and demands of citizens and directly collaborating in the decision-making process. Through community and grassroots organizations, civil society can effectively communicate the needs of vulnerable groups that are often voiceless and serve as a bridge between them and government institutions. It is able to articulate, aggregate and represent specific interests of the population, especially those traditionally excluded from access to power and representation — such as women, minorities and indigenous peoples — and serve as brokers with political parties and state institutions. Through such activities, civil society can contribute to making state policies more sensitive and responsive to the needs and opinions of these groups.

State-civil society collaborative policy-making processes seem especially well suited to address a wide range of difficult and complex social issues such as the environment and sustainable development; crime and safety; discrimination and social justice; and poverty and social equity. The establishment of a development structure that integrates the participation of civil society and government at local/village, intermediate/commune and/or district, regional/province and national levels within a single coherent framework is of paramount importance. This integration can help countries to capitalize, in policy terms, on experience gained at the community level and to institutionalize grassroots participation in decision-making.

[143] Ibid., p 28.

[144] Waseem Mahmood, "Policy Analysis of Electronic Media Practices in South Asia: A Comparative Study," UNDP and Baltic Media Center, August 2001, p. 20.

Civil society in many LDCs has mobilized in the area of poverty alleviation, particularly in the PRSP process. For many civil society organizations, which have been constant and effective advocates for poverty reduction, a PRSP provides an important opportunity to be involved in national policy formulation — and most civil society input has been oriented towards ensuring that the strategy explicitly links poverty reduction with debt-relief measures. However, studies indicate that civil society participation in PRSPs has been uneven. The fact that PRSPs are processes mandated by international financial institutions and owned and managed by the national governments often creates tensions with civil society. Frequently, civil society refuses to have "symbolic" consultations as a means of promoting acceptance of politically controversial policies.[145] In particular, civil society organizations in LDCs have complained about lack of gender perspective.

These complaints and drawbacks notwithstanding, experience indicates that civil society engagement with PRSPs has been essential in ensuring people-centred policy choices. In Uganda, for example, the proactive engagement of civil society led to the allocation of a substantial and strategic trust fund for poverty. This fund is currently managed by civil society organizations in collaboration with other development partners.[146]

**Examples from other LDCs indicate that civil society involvement has been instrumental in assisting marginalized and disenfranchised groups to articulate and advocate their rights**

Examples from other LDCs indicate that civil society involvement has been instrumental in assisting marginalized and disenfranchised groups to articulate and advocate their rights. In Cambodia and the Lao PDR, a partnership project between UNDP and indigenous organizations in the Mekong sub-region has focused on strengthening policy dialogue on sustainable development in indigenous communities. The project tackles three general areas of concern: ownership, the use of land and natural resources and environmental management; cultural autonomy and the protection of cultural and intellectual property; and participation in the formal decision-making of the State.[147]

Experience shows that the involvement of civil society organizations in post-crisis relief and recovery efforts can significantly contribute to these efforts' success and sustainability.[148] Conversely, exclusion of civil society contributes to inefficiencies and failures and can negatively affect people's livelihoods. Civil society groups representing vulnerable and marginalized groups are of special significance because they can champion these groups' interest during post-conflict reconstruction processes.

Civil society involvement in policy-making requires the creation and maintenance of constant links among government official and donors. Although distrust between the two sectors can limit cooperation, experience indicates that it is precisely when civil society organizations collaborate with state institutions that they have more opportunities to strengthen and improve state policy. In Mozambique, for example, civil society organizations have been working closely with legislators to create awareness of gender issues. By doing so, they have been able to develop women caucuses and to promote important policies for the improvement of women while gaining experience in parliamentary rules and procedures.[149]

---

[145] UNDP, "Partners in Human Development: UNDP and Civil Society Organization," 2003, p. 27.

[146] UNDP, "UNDP and Civil Society: Partnerships at Glance," August 2002, www.undp.org/poverty/civil.htm.

[147] UNDP, "Partners in Human Development: UNDP and Civil Society Organization," 2003, pp. 26-27.

[148] UNDP, "Experiences from the Field: UNDP-CSO Partnerships for Conflict Prevention," July 2005.

[149] John K. Johnson and Robert Nakamura, "Concept Paper on Legislatures and Good Governance," 1999, pp. 29-32.

### Providing basic social services

In recent years, civil society in many LDCs has become more involved in delivering basic services to communities. NGOs and other community-based organizations can provide the information necessary for understanding the needs and expectations of poor people with regard to service delivery. In this way they offer important skills and resources that the State and private sector may lack. Civil society provision of social services has contributed to fill important capacity gaps.

Civil society organizations have worked to safeguard the environment and ensure efficient access to forestry and water resources. In the Lao PDR, where forest resources are a major source of foreign exchange and domestic energy consumption, civil society members have organized village forestry committees. Through these committees, civil society has been able to effectively manage and control access to the forest resources, thus ensuring responsible and efficient use while minimizing environmental degradation.

In many LDCs, civil society organizations have been significantly active in primary education, health services and water supply. The education programme of the Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee (BRAC),[150] which it calls "non-formal," is well-known around the world. In Zambia, through the work of CARE,[151] a piped water supply network was developed independent of the existing and resource-strained public-sector network. This network now serves around 6,500 households and 45,000 residents. In Arusha in the United Republic of Tanzania, a new system of public standpipes managed by neighbourhood representative known as *mtaa leaders* was introduced in 1993 as part of a water and sanitation rehabilitation programme. Water is available through this

## Box 3.4. Communal latrines in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

Since the nationalization of property by the former Ethiopian military regime, the majority of low-income people in Addis Ababa have lived in houses owned and administered by kebeles (the smallest administrative units of the city administration). Domestic sanitation is mainly provided through pit latrines and septic tanks. In congested areas of the city, where the majority of poor people live, residents use communal latrines shared by between 5 and 10 families. The operation and maintenance of shared facilities is often difficult.

Through a project undertaken by an NGO, the Integrated Holistic Approach Urban Development Programme (IHA-UDP), sanitation conditions were improved in four kebeles. The beneficiaries were some 42,000 people in 5,000 households, 76 percent of whom did not have latrines. The NGO's approach was based on building an enhanced sense of ownership and responsibility on the part of the users by delegating management of the facilities to them.

Each communal block consists of blocks of latrines, located in a public area, and made up of 2 to 10 rooms. Each room is used by 3 or 4 households, all of which have a key and take turns cleaning the latrine. When a pit is filled up, all users contribute funding to have it emptied. Users also select a representative to deal with general management of the latrine, including the coordination of cleaning rosters and collection of money for emptying the pit by vacuum truck.

*Sources: UN-HABITAT, Better Water and Sanitation for the Urban Poor, Nairobi, Kenya, European Communities and Water Utilities Partnerships, 2003; Simie, E., "Ethiopia Case Study, Water Utilities Partnership", Project no. 5, unpublished document*

[150] See www.brac.net.

[151] CARE International is a global humanitarian organization working with over 45 million disadvantaged people in 70 of the world's poorest countries. Online: www.care.org/.

system at a cost of 3 US cents per 20 litres, far lower than the kiosk price of 10 cents. An example of civil society activity in sanitation is provided in Box 3.4).[152]

Perhaps one of the most striking examples of civil society involvement in service delivery relates to the expanding crisis of HIV/AIDS (see Box 3.5). In many African LDCs in particular, civil society organizations have developed projects and programmes to provide prevention and treatment education and HIV-related health care. The Southern Africa Capacity Initiative (SACI) was designed to address the challenges posed by HIV/AIDS. Lesotho, Malawi and Mozambique are members of this initiative, which focuses on developing partnerships and coalitions to combat the disease.[153] These steps are undoubtedly important and helpful. However, the civil society's effectiveness in service delivery is being jeopardized by the rampant spread of the epidemic, which has taken the lives of many people engaged in delivering social services to the public.

In general, service delivery in LDCs has largely been carried out by public partnerships between the private sector and civil society. Examples from Africa and Asia show

## Box 3.5. Uganda: HIV/AIDS and the positive effects of public-private partnerships

In Uganda, as elsewhere in sub-Saharan Africa, HIV/AIDS has caused immense human suffering over the past two decades, setting back development and reducing life expectancy. More than 1.5 million children have been orphaned since the epidemic began.

Unique among many other hard-hit nations, however, Uganda has had significant success in reducing HIV prevalence in the past several years. In the capital, Kampala, HIV prevalence among pregnant women attending antenatal clinics fell from 31 percent in 1993 to 14 percent by 1998. Meanwhile, outside Kampala, infection rates among pregnant women under 20 dropped from 21 percent in 1990 to 8 percent in 1998. Elsewhere, among men attending STD clinics, HIV infection rates fell from 46 percent in 1992 to 30 percent in 1998.

Uganda's success in lowering HIV prevalence can be attributed largely to a broad-based national prevention involving a wide range of partners and all sectors of society, and backed by firm political commitment. The government worked with religious and traditional leaders, community groups, NGOs and other groups to forge a consensus around the need to contain the escalating spread of HIV. The Uganda AIDS Commission (UAC) spearheads joint planning for and monitoring and evaluation of the national response. Key stakeholders are periodically brought together to identify priority areas for the national programme and for particular areas of the response. This ensures a shared perspective and focus on a common problem, and promotes ownership of the national programme by the various stakeholders.

The goal of the nation's Political Mobilization Strategy (PMS) is to promote national and community responses to HIV/AIDS. The strategy enhances political and administrative commitment of the various leaders by identifying what they are doing, what they are not doing and why; recommends how they can be mobilized and facilitated to act; and projects the possible impact of their active involvement. The PMS therefore seeks to identify barriers to active participation. It relates the struggle against HIV/AIDS to poverty eradication in Uganda while addressing HIV/AIDS as a development crisis.

*Source: "Partner Reduction in HIV Prevention: The Neglected Middle Child of 'ABC'," James D. Shelton, Daniel T. Halperin, Vinand Nantulya, Malcolm Potts, Helene D. Gayle and K. K. Holmes, US Agency for International Development and Uganda AIDS Commission's National Aids and Information Centre*

[152] UN-HABITAT, "Better Water and Sanitation for the Urban Poor," Nairobi, Kenya, European Communities and Water Utilities Partnerships, 2003.

[153] UNDP, "UNDP in Africa: Supporting Africa to Meet the Challenges of the 21st Century," p. 19.

that partnerships are able to improve service delivery for poor people if they respond to local circumstances and empower local communities and governments. For example, public-private partnerships have developed cost-effective and efficient sanitation systems after meeting with community members and learning their specific needs and wants.[154] In Cambodia, electricity is provided to more than one third of the population by small private providers.

In Bangladesh, BRAC has identified three basic constraints to gainful employment of low income and marginalized people in rural areas: lack of working capital, marketing support and opportunity for skills development. In 1978, BRAC established a marketing arm called Aarong, with a goal of providing a stable and gainful source of employment for rural artisans. The project has contributed greatly to poverty alleviation and empowerment of the poor; more than 30,000 people, 85 percent of whom are women, currently receive services and support through Aarong.[155]

In Senegal, as in other LDCs, rapid urbanization has had a considerable impact on social and cultural transformations, economic growth and development. Cities face chaotic management structures, and many residents lack access to even the most basic

## Box 3.6. Creating partnerships with civil society: Senegal's Local Initiative Facility for Urban Environment (LIFE)

In 1998, the Government of Senegal launched an initiative called "Cleanliness and Environment Management: Response of Women." Three urban development projects related to this initiative, one each in the cities of Kolda, Thiès and Yeumbeul, were financed by the Local Initiative Facility for the Urban Environment (LIFE), started by UNDP in 1992. The projects in Kolda and Yeumbeul were awarded special recognition from the Government of Senegal for their successful implementation.

In Kolda, the project aimed at improving sanitation and drinking water supplies. It had four components: household garbage collection, building of latrines, construction of a public restroom and rehabilitation of household wells. Both the Kolda and Yeumbeul projects involved representatives from all community and governmental fields. Beneficiaries of the improvements were mainly poor urban dwellers, who had improved access to sanitation, garbage collection, drinking water and a credit-savings scheme. Permanent employment was also generated through the garbage collection operation, and temporary contracts were provided due to infrastructure projects. Moreover, in terms of gender equality, the training provided to women has substantially enhanced their awareness of health issues and their inherent decision-making capacities.

Local craftsmen were involved in the different infrastructure projects, including the construction of water fountains and public toilets, which helped them acquire useful new skills. Young people, most of whom were unemployed and had few skills, also participated and gained important work experience and training. Last but not least, all project partners were directly involved on an equal basis in the decision-making process and were given the opportunity of observing, which illustrated the positive impact a working local partnership can have on urban development.

Because the projects were designed according to the actual needs of the beneficiaries, there was strong, if not enthusiastic, support from the population in the implementation of the projects. The improvements in the urban environment are likely to be sustainable because the population played an important role in their implementation.

*Source: First Forum of the World Alliance of Cities Against Poverty Proceedings, 12-14 October 1998, Lyon, France, e-discussion: "Grass Root Development Institute: Local Initiative Facility for Urban Environment (LIFE)."*

[154] UN-HABITAT, "Water and Sanitation for Cities," *Habitat Debate*, Vol. 9, No. 3, September 2003, p. 6.

urban services. Civil society organizations in Senegal have partnered with multilateral organizations to address environmental problems affecting poor people in urban centres and influence policies through participatory processes (see Box 3.6).

### Civil society's role in environmental sustainability

Civil society in many LDCs is involved in important issues related to environmental regeneration and environmental sustainability. The work has been carried out by NGOs that focus exclusively on environmental issues as well as those with broader interests. In many instances, communities have also mobilized themselves to respond to environmental problems and policies. The contributions of civil society generally focus on three fronts: first, to raise environmental awareness through public advocacy; second, to ensure legal rights of communities for community commons such as forests, pastures and grazing lands, and ponds; and third, to enhance environmental regeneration and to combat environmental degradation.

In Bangladesh, civil society organizations have implemented programmes that focus on reforestation near villages, schools and roads. Some help to educate the public about how to cope with natural disasters such as flooding. In Nepal, local NGOs are working to minimize indoor air pollution by increasing poor people's access to cleaner energy sources. In Senegal, communities and NGOs work together to deal with local waste and refuse problems (see Box 3.7).

## Box 3.7. Community management of urban environment in Senegal

Rufisque is a small township outside Dakar, Senegal's capital. For years, most people had little or no access to clean water or sanitation services, which resulted in a high incidence of various diseases. In 1991, in conjunction with community leaders in Rufisque, the international NGO ENDA Third World created a new, low-tech sanitation project with the aim of solving the local waste water and refuse problems.

By 1996, the scheme involved about one third of the population in nine low-income communities in the district, with most of the active participants being women. Young people were also involved; many of them now operate the water-purification and household waste-treatment plants and are also responsible for the maintenance of the sewer networks.

While the NGO acts as a project manager and retains overall responsibility for the project, democratically elected local management committees control the planning, monitoring and evaluation processes. Through a revolving fund, which mobilizes and manages local savings, the project has become sustainable and requires little, if any, external assistance.

*Source: Anne Marie Goetz and John Gaventa, Bringing Citizen Voice and Client Focus into Service Delivery, UK: Institute of Development Studies, July 2001, IDS Working Paper 138.*

In many LDCs, biodiversity is critical to the livelihoods of poor people. They may depend, for example, on community forests for honey and other forest products to sell and generate income; firewood and fuel (such as charcoal); medicine; and items used in festivals and social events. Environmental degradation places the livelihoods of poor communities at risk.

Communities are taking action to address these concerns, however. Long a popular tourist spot, the Jozani Forest Reserve in the United Republic of Tanzania was long threatened with extensive degradation due to rapid population growth, which increase

[155] See www.brac-aarong.com.

demand for wood; conflict between the government and communities; and poorly defined property rights. In 1995, the Jozani Chwaka Bay Conservation Project was created to reduce community dependence on forest products, improve community livelihoods, encourage common resource management and develop a protected forest area. The villages set up committees to produce plans for managing their surrounding forest resources. Local forest guards were recruited to curb wood-cutting without licenses. Workshops have helped to educate villagers about the wider issues involved, and visits to other villages with severe degraded resources have raised community members' awareness of the need to preserve their own. Under pressure from the community, the government agreed to allocate 30 percent of reserve entrance fees for a local development fund (in 1997, for example, Jozani attracted 18,000 tourists, generating $40,000 in entrance fees). The communities have chosen to use this money to improve schools and health centres, repair wells and upgrade roads. Alternative micro-enterprise is promoted both to diversify income generation away from dependence on timber and to increase the value of resources legally obtained and used. The Jozani experience is also an example of an effective alliance among local communities, the government and international organizations.[156]

Civil society organizations in LDCs have also done significant advocacy work on global environmental issues. For example, NGOs in Bangladesh and Maldives have raised the issue of global warming in various regional and international forums, and have pressured their governments to make it a priority.

## Limitations and challenges of civil society in LDCs

Civil society's influence in most LDCs continues to grow, but the sector still faces major challenges and limitations. The strength of civil society is uneven among LDCs. Democratic systems of government often struggle with problems related to their functioning, representation and legitimacy. These problems are related to the lack or weakness of mechanisms of dialogue and participation that would enable civil society and the people at large — especially the poorest and most marginalized in society — to have more of a say in policy decisions and monitoring procedures. Such shortfalls are extremely problematic because civil society participation is crucial for effective democratic development.

Many civil society organizations in LDCs cannot exercise their full potential due to human, financial and legal constraints. An important limit to their activities comes from the lack of financial autonomy and legal standing. In many LDCs, civil society organizations are highly dependent on foreign resources and find it difficult to survive without external support from international funding agencies or their international NGO counterparts. Although international support undoubtedly has been useful in helping increase the number of effective local NGOs, it has also meant that actively or passively, international donors tend to impose their own agendas onto national and local NGOs. This raises questions related to local empowerment and ownership.

**Many civil society organizations in LDCs cannot exercise their full potential due to human, financial and legal constraints.**

Funding can be a complicated issue for many civil society organizations that provide social services. They generally wish to remain independent of the government despite their reliance on public funding for some of their services; too often, however, public

[156] Robert Wild, "The Jozani-Chwaka Bay Conservation Project, Zanzibar," 1998.

funds are provided only in exchange for political support, thus compromising many organizations' independence. These are important considerations. However, experience in some LDCs shows that once civil society organizations gain credibility within a community for their work, monetary contributions from governments either for services rendered or annual grants do not necessarily compromise their independence.[157]

Civil society activities are also limited when regulatory frameworks are weak. In many LDCs, laws and norms regulating the activities of NGOs and other civil society organizations limit their potential by excluding them from effectively influencing policy or acting as watch dogs. At the same time, many civil society organizations themselves have poor internal governance structures and lack the accountability and transparency that they demand from their governments — a situation that affects the organizations' credibility and leadership. The lack of internal accountability and capacity also seriously hampers civil society's capability to receive and absorb financial resources. In order to play its role most effectively, civil society requires the following: 1) an enabling environment that includes legal norms facilitating its recognition and institutionalization; 2) a culture of dialogue and transparency (which both civil society and the State contribute to developing); and 3) the material resources (including their provision by the State) necessary to making a meaningful contribution to social debate. In post-conflict settings, civil society has a big impact on reconstruction efforts where lack of accountability and transparency can generate corruption.[158]

Finally, many civil society organizations in LDCs lack knowledge and training on how state institutions work; public policy design and implementation; and administrative and managerial skills. Human resource development within civil society therefore is crucial for achieving a vibrant participatory society and to generate good governance.

## The private sector

The private sector is a major actor in democratic governance. Securing and maintaining peace, stability and good governance depends in part on economic and employment opportunities that provide enough income to improve living standards. The private sector is an essential source of opportunities for productive employment and economic growth; its strength helps create a vibrant society and gives people the opportunity to use their energy and expertise in creative and productive ways. Thus, development results from the ongoing interaction among three agents of change: the State, civil society and the private sector. A thorough understanding of the role of the private sector depends on the ability to distinguish among various private-sector entities, given that their structures, objectives and modus operandi may be asymmetrical (see Box 3.8).

**The private sector is an essential source of opportunities for productive employment and economic growth; its strength helps create a vibrant society and gives people the opportunity to use their energy and expertise in creative and productive ways.**

To effectively help promote democratic governance, the private sector needs not only to be strong, but also to be responsive to society. The private sector can contribute to peace, stability and good governance by maintaining fair and competitive markets; ensuring that poor people (especially women and other vulnerable groups) have equal access to economic opportunities, productive employment and credit; fostering enterprises that produce jobs and opportunities; attracting investment and helping the trans-

[157] Thuy Mellor and Jak Jabes, *Governance in the Pacific: Focus for Action 2005-2009*, ADB, 2005, p. 39.

[158] Daniel Large, *Corruption in Post-War Reconstruction: Confronting the Vicious Circle*, The Lebanese Transparency Association, UNDP and TIRI (The Governance Access Learning Network), 2003.

## Box 3.8. What constitutes the private sector

The private sector includes transnational corporations, small- and medium-scale enterprises and the informal sector. In many cases, transnational activities in a country are known to create isolated economic enclaves without any forward and backward linkages to the rest of the economy. Many repatriate profits, which limits the benefits provided to local communities. They often take advantage of eased financial and regulatory policies (e.g., operating in export-processing zones) but ignore workers' rights (e.g., the absence of a right to unionize in export-processing zones). Transnational corporations sometimes fail to live up to their social responsibility (e.g., with regard to environmental degradation).

Small- and medium-scale enterprises often do not get process and policy support from the State — either in terms of simplifying the procedure for approvals or in terms of policy incentives (e.g., tax cuts). The informal sector, which is at the bottom of the ladder, contributes significantly to both employment generation and economic growth in many countries. Yet this sector faces challenges related to legality, unfair treatment and discrimination; receives no policy support; and is subjected to extortion and violence by law enforcement.

*Source: Selim Jahan, "Informal Sector in Developing Countries: Issues and Strategies," Rashid Amjad (ed.), Global Employment Forum Report, Geneva, ILO, March 2002, pp. 123-135.*

fer of knowledge and technologies, particularly for the poor; providing incentives for human resource development; and protecting the environment and natural resources.

Small- and medium-sized enterprises are often innovative, flexible and important sources of job creation and entrepreneurship. In many LDCs, however, such enterprises are marginal to the national economy. Many operate in the informal sector (outside the formal legal system), in which case they contribute little if anything to tax revenues, and others lack access to financing and long-term capital — the basis on which companies are built.[159] Creating an enabling environment involves steps to reduce the share of the informal sector in an economy, steps best taken by reforming and opening the formal economy.

The challenge is to capitalize on advances in macroeconomic stability and democratic governance (including the rule of law) and to launch reforms that bring about further changes in institutional frameworks to unleash and foster the private sector. Also essential for promoting rapid growth in domestic private investment are increases in the flow of development aid and reforming the global trading system to provide fair economic opportunities to producers from developing countries.

Although the private sector in many LDCs is relatively small, there are many positive initiatives taking place in these countries. For example, in some LDCs the private sector is providing essential utilities to a significant percentage of the population, including people residing in the poorest communities.

### Private-sector contributions

Small- and medium-scale enterprises and the informal sectors are especially important to efforts to address LDCs' economic and human development challenges. For example, the garment industry in Bangladesh, which consists mostly of small- and medium-sized enterprises, generates revenues of $2 billion every year from linkages with the rest of the

[159] Commission on the Private Sector and Development, "Unleashing Entrepreneurship: Making Business Work for Poor People, Report to the Secretary-General of the United Nations," New York, 2004, p. 1.

economy in addition to contributing to direct export earnings.[160] In sub-Saharan Africa, meanwhile, which is home to most LDCs, the informal sector accounts for 72 percent of non-agricultural employment and 41 percent of GDP.[161]

Micro-enterprises are often the most common type of economic activity in LDCs. Operating mainly in the informal sector of the economy, they provide subsistence employment to workers who cannot find employment in the formal sector. However, it should be noted that poor quality jobs, low pay, overwork, and unsafe and unhealthy working conditions are widespread in the informal sector. Initiatives have been launched in some LDCs to improve working conditions and economic viability. In Uganda, for example, through the use of ICTs (mainly radio), some programmes have been initiated to help small enterprises gain access to training and other resources.[162]

There is a significant gender dimension in small- and medium-scale enterprises as well as in the informal sector. In some LDCs, women comprise an important part of the informal sector, working from home in both rural and urban areas. This is particularly true in countries that culturally or legally restrict women's access to the formal economy. Some two million women are employed in Bangladesh's garment industry. In sub-Saharan Africa, meanwhile, 84 percent of workers in non-agricultural informal employment are women. In the region's informal sector overall, two of every three women employed are self-employed. In Benin and Chad, the share of women's informal employment in non-agricultural sectors is as high as 95 percent. The poorest women in LDCs are employed in agriculture or in the informal sector, and their work is vastly undercounted in employment statistics. In LDCs, women's contribution accounts for more than 75 percent of the post-harvesting work in agriculture.[163]

Service provision is an area where the private sector can play a very important role in improving the quality of life of poor people, who in most part of the world are the ones who pay higher prices and receive the lowest quality of services. In many LDCs, the private sector is already providing services where the government is unable to do so. In Cambodia, for example, small private business provides energy — from battery recharging to fully metered electricity — to more that one third of the population. In Mali, the district of Yirimadio within the city of Bamako is not served by the Energie du Mali (EDM) public water utility. Its 11,000 residents instead are supplied by a private water provider, whose services were originally established through the Drinking Water Supply in the Outlying Districts of Bamako Project. Two other private water suppliers were established in the Sebenikaro and Sikorori districts. Both are supplied by private boreholes and are connected into the EDM electricity supply network. The private sector is also involved in sanitation services (see Box 3.9).

**In many LDCs, the private sector is already providing services where the government is unable to do so.**

There also instances where private-sector involvement in service delivery did not work, however, and NGOs had to be brought in. For example, the water supply to Dakar, Senegal and some 50 other urban areas is provided by Senegalaise Des Eaux

[160] Hafiz Pasha, "When Textile Quotas Disappear," *International Herald Tribune*, IHT Online, 30 December 2004.

[161] Selim Jahan, "Reorienting Development: Towards an Engendered Employment Strategy," UNDP, 2004, p. 4, online: www.undp.org/poverty/docs/gender-employment-delhi.doc.

[162] Mary McVay, "An Information Revolution for Small Enterprise in Africa: Experience in Interactive Radio Formats in Africa," Geneva, ILO, 2002, SEED Paper No. 27.

[163] Selim Jahan, "Reorienting Development: Towards an Engendered Employment Strategy," UNDP, 2004, p. 5, online: www.undp.org/poverty/docs/gender-employment-delhi.doc.

## Box 3.9. Pit-emptying service in the United Republic of Tanzania: private-sector involvement

In 1996, the Dar Es Salaam City Commission (DCC), which is responsible for sanitation in the country's commercial capital and largest city, decided to deregulate pit-emptying services. Prior to that, under existing law, the Dar Es Salaam Sewerage and Sanitation Department (DSSD) was the only organization permitted to provide pit-emptying service to the public. However, DSSD was unable to meet the demand from a long waiting list of customers, many of who had paid an advance equal to $25 per service in 1995. Consequently, over several years, clandestine private operators began to fill the unmet demand.

Flooding in 1996 led to an outbreak of cholera on an unprecedented scale in a number of areas in the city. This forced the DCC to look for alternative means to provide pit-emptying services, including authorizing private operators. At the start of the process in 1996, there were three known private firms operating without a permit; after deregulation in 1999, eight private operators applied for and received permits. The increase clearly shows that the activity is profitable, even in a strongly competitive market.

Competition continues to play a key role in keeping prices affordable. Private operators are now charging about 50 percent less than the former DSSD rates.

*Source : Wandera, B., "Tanzania Case Study — Strengthening the Capacity of Water Utilities to Deliver Water Sanitation Services, Environmental Health and Hygiene Education to Low Income Urban Communities," Water Utility Partnership for Capacity Building, Abidjan, 2000.*

(SDE), a private company with a 10-year contract (1996-2006) with the Senegalese National Water Authority (SONES) to manage and deliver water services. Because the procedures and practices of SONES and SDE for dealing with household connections were not considered appropriate to poor neighbourhoods — where community rather than individual solutions must be applied —SDE and SONES in 1999 entered into a partnership with ENDA, an NGO experienced in social engineering to design a strategy for reaching low-income consumers.[164]

### Constraints to private-sector development in LDCs

Conducting business in LDCs is often complicated by lack of sufficient infrastructure (poor energy, transport and telecommunications infrastructure) and the resulting transaction costs for the private sector.[165] Many LDCs in Africa and Asia are looking for innovative ways to solve some of these problems, particularly through the use of public-private partnerships. A number of LDCs (e.g., Madagascar, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zambia) have simplified regulations affecting the entry, operation and exit of private enterprises. However, much more remains to be done.

Private-sector development needs improved mechanisms of dialogue between government and private sector as well as between different private-sector enterprises. Consultations involving business associations, labour unions, small and informal enterprises, prominent business leaders and the government can have greatly improve policy implementation and development of the private sector. In Cambodia and Uganda, forums involving both the private sector and the government have been important in

[164] See UN-HABITAT and European Communities and Water Utilities Partnerships, "Better Water and Sanitation for the Urban Poor," Nairobi, Kenya, 2003; UN-HABITAT, "Water and Sanitation for Cities" in *Habitat Debate*, Vol. 9, No. 3, 2003; UN-OHRLLS, "Critical Importance of Water Issues for the Least Developed Countries (LDCs)," 2003; WUP Africa, "Better Water and Sanitation for the Urban Poor: Good Practices from Sub-Saharan Africa," 2003.

[165] See UN ECA, "Fourth African Development Forum: Governance for Progressive Africa," October 2004, p. 39.

promoting legal reforms, controlling corruption and creating an environment of trust and entrepreneurship. In Senegal, consultative mechanisms have included all stakeholders such as labour union, academics, the media, NGOs as well as the government and the private sector, resulting in a successful policy dialogue and networks.[166]

The creation of networks involving the private sector can contribute to the transfer of skills, technology and quality; ensure that foreign direct investment has positive spillover effects; bring companies into the formal sector; open markets and the supply of inputs to smaller firms through networks of larger partners; and improve the capacity of small and medium enterprises to borrow. In Bangladesh, for example, a joint venture between a local Bangladeshi company and Daewoo, a Korean company, launched a successful garment export industry that now accounts for more than half of the country exports. This partnership was based on training local employees in the latest production techniques.[167]

The issue of transparency and accountability is of prime importance for the private sector in LDCs, particularly for foreign companies and multinational corporations. One promising initiative is the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative, which is being implemented in a number of African countries. Under this initiative, oil, gas and mining companies publicly disclose all payments they make to governments, and governments in turn publish what they receive from these companies. Individual citizens and concerned groups can then scrutinize these publications. This scheme is in its early phase, and work is still under way to clarify implementation requirements. The initiative may not solve all transparency problems immediately, but it is an important first step towards greater accountability. The international community and more African governments need to back this initiative and encourage all resource-rich countries to sign it.

**The issue of transparency and accountability is of prime importance for the private sector in LDCs, particularly for foreign companies and multinational corporations**

São Tomé and Principe is one of the LDCs in the region that has already signed this initiative. It includes funding the training of civil servants and public systems to make the scheme work. The civil society organizations that monitor the initiative will also need similar assistance. However, the oil and mining sectors are not the only ones where money is lost due to poor management and corruption. Sectors like the forestry and fisheries industries could also benefit from more openness about revenue flows, and the international community should support this as well.[168]

Small and medium enterprises tend to be engines of job creation, centres of innovation and entrepreneurship. However, in many LDCs small and medium enterprises face significant challenges that result in their having a marginal economic role to date.[169] Small and medium enterprises in LDCs "have difficulties relating to access to finance, counselling, information, skills, technology, and markets. An additional challenge is posed by the policy and business environment in which they operate, which is changing rapidly as a result of market-oriented reforms and technological change." [170]

The ability of small and medium enterprises to grow may also be restricted by large

[166] Benjamin Herzberg and Andrew Wright, "Competitive Partnerships — Building and Maintaining Public-Private Dialogue to Improve Investment Climate," World Bank Working Papers (WPS3683), September 2004, p. 14.

[167] Commission on the Private Sector and Development, "Unleashing Entrepreneurship: Making Business Work for Poor People," Report to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, New York, 2004, p. 31.

[168] See www.commissionforafrica.org/english/report/thereport/english/11-03-05_cr_report.pdf.

[169] Commission on the Private Sector and Development, "Unleashing Entrepreneurship: Making Business Work for Poor People, Report to the Secretary-General of the United Nations," New York, 2004, p. 13.

[170] UNDP, "Small and Medium Enterprise Development," *Essentials*, No. 1, November 1999.

companies taking advantage of weak institutional environments and rising anticompetitive barriers to protect their dominant position. Nonetheless, there are examples in some LDCs where large companies have supported small and medium enterprises. In Angola, after the signing of the peace agreement in 2002, the government, UNDP and ChevronTexaco created the Angola Enterprise Programme to support micro and small enterprise development. The programme has cantered on vocational training, business and development services, microfinance as well as research into the informal sector and development policies allowing micro and small business flourish.[171]

Informal enterprises experience severe constraints regarding access to resources and the legal system and its benefits. In general, informal enterprises are not able to borrow money in financial institutions because they are not formally registered as business organizations or because they do not have title to the land they use. Moreover, the informality of the economy presents challenges for small and medium entrepreneurs that want to operate in the formal sector. Formal entrepreneurs are affected by an uneven enforcement of laws and poor mechanisms for protecting property and contracts.[172] Formal small and medium businesses find it difficult to compete with the low prices of informal enterprises because they have to pay taxes, whereas informal ones do not. Building a sound private sector in LDCs requires a strong foundation in the global and domestic macroeconomic environment, physical and social infrastructure, and clear and enforceable laws.

**In some LDCs, there are important ongoing efforts to tackle the problem of informality and the improvement of employment through joint efforts between labour, business and government.**

In some LDCs, there are important ongoing efforts to tackle the problem of informality and the improvement of employment through joint efforts between labour, business and government. In Benin, for example, through the ILO's small enterprise unit, support was given to women food processors so that they could operate as formal enterprises. They were given advice and training on how to create savings and credits schemes as well as training in management, food preparation and new product ideas.[173]

Important measures need to be taken to strengthen capacity. A well-educated and healthy labour force is essential for raising productivity and competitiveness within the private sector. Improving the quality of the labour force needs to be made a priority by both the State and society overall. Governments need to improve service provision of education and health and the private sector can invest in training opportunities for its workers. In fact, in many developing countries, education and health services are provided to a great extent by the private sector, including through cooperatives and mutual health insurance organizations.[174]

### Public-private partnership

Creating sustainable development requires that states and their development partners (the private sector, local communities, and civil society organizations) join efforts and resources for improving the delivery and quality of basic services to all citizens, with special attention to those who need them most. UNDP defines public-private partnerships

[171] Jennifer Barsky, "UNDP and the Private Sector: Building Partnerships for Development," May 2004, p. 28.

[172] UNDP, "Small and Medium Enterprise Development," *Essentials*, No. 1, November 1999.

[173] International Labour Organization, "Decent Employment through Small Enterprises: A Progress Report on SEED Activities," Geneva, 2003, p. 31.

[174] Commission on the Private Sector and Development, "Unleashing Entrepreneurship: Making Business Work for Poor People," Report to the Secretary-General of the United Nations," New York, 2004, p. 16.

as the spectrum of possible relations between public and private actors for the co-operative provision of infrastructure services.[175] At their best, public-private partnerships can combine the best of both sectors — the public sector's notion of public accountability and social and environmental responsibility and the private sector's values of managerial efficiency and entrepreneurship, as well as resources and technology. However, these partnerships still must face the challenge of guaranteeing access to social services to all citizens while maintaining profitability.

In Bhutan, cultivation, livestock, and forestry support 85 percent of the population and form about 36 percent of the national GDP. Farms are clustered in river valleys, on steep hillsides, and, in the south, in the foothills. Rice is Bhutan's main staple crop. In the late 1980s, Bhutan produced about 70 percent of its domestic requirement. Production has since dropped to less than 60 percent of self-sufficiency. Projected demand over the next 20 years registers the need for rapid and sustainable productivity increases. Self-sufficiency in rice is no longer considered realistic, yet maintenance of a reasonable level of self-sufficiency remains a high priority. In Bhutan, public-private partnership has been crucial for enhancing food security.[176]

## Box 3.10. The Adopt-an-Island Initiative: public and private partnerships in Maldives

UNDP Maldives has developed an initiative called Adopt-An-Island to support the Government of Maldives with its tsunami recovery work in three key sectors: shelter reconstruction, infrastructure rehabilitation and restoration of livelihoods. The initiative's objective is to generate public- and private-sector support for post-tsunami recovery effort. Supporters include businesses, civil society organizations, foundations, governments and individuals. Adopt-An-Island is a highly effective, personal means of contributing to the recovery of this island nation because all donations are allocated to readily identifiable projects. In accordance with the recognition that this country's recovery begins with people's homes, the programme seeks to address the urgent need for shelter while laying the foundation for an integrated long-term sustainable recovery of the housing sector in all of the country's atolls.

Three months after the tsunami washed away most of the buildings on Naalaafushi island, every family has a roof over their head and every home has been rebuilt. A private-sector resort, Banyan Tree, volunteered its services, time, manpower and funding to work with the community of Naalaafushi and UNDP. Rebuilding a house in a remote island can cost more than 10 years of a person's income because most of the construction materials need to be imported and transported by boat. In Naalaafushi, UNDP provided the tools, materials and development expertise, and the Banyan Tree group dispatched carpenters, plumbers and other construction workers from its resort to assist local residents with reconstruction. For weeks, boats travelled between the capital, Male, and the island, carrying tons of building materials. Dozens of men and women affected by the tsunami received "cash-for-work" and were provided an income and training to repair more than 70 houses in just over two months. This public-private partnership enabled and empowered the people of Naalaafushi to quickly and efficiently rebuild their island, and can become a model for other successful public-private partnerships in the Maldivian reconstruction effort.

*Source: www.mv.undp.org/adopt/banyantree.htm.*

[175] See http://pppue.undp.org.

[176] International Development Research Centre in Bhutan; online: http://reseau.crdi.ca/en/ev-11047-201-1-DO_TOPIC.html.

**Private-public partnership has contributed significantly in LDCs in conflict situations and in the aftermath of natural disasters.**

Private-public partnership has contributed significantly in LDCs in conflict situations and in the aftermath of natural disasters. The recent tsunami disaster is a good example. The December 2004 catastrophe damaged approximately one fourth of the essential infrastructure on which most livelihoods are based in Maldives. It devastated the country's transportation network, destroying jetties, quay walls, sea walls and other civil works in harbours, as well as telecommunications networks, electric power supply systems and water and sanitation systems. Restoring people's livelihoods is one of Maldives greatest challenges. Agricultural land and fisheries were destroyed and tens of thousands of people lost essential tools and equipment of their trades. Many families also lost their life savings, which they kept in their homes. Cash-for-work programmes are generating income for communities to rebuild their villages, and microcredit initiatives are helping people restart their small family businesses. Private-public partnerships have been initiated to address these issues (see Box 3.10).

Democratic governance at the national and local level promotes a solid environment for dealing with these obstacles and for creating trust and understanding among entities in the public and private sectors. The experience of public-private partnerships in LDCs indicates that institutional, political and legal deficiencies undermine these partnerships and create barriers to the effective provision of services for poor people. One reason is that corruption flourishes without clear legal and institutional frameworks, thus discouraging private-sector investment. In addition, it is essential to assign clear responsibilities for national and local governments and to firmly establish the State's role in provision and regulation. The private sector, on the other hand, should provide social services to the community in compliance with agreed standards and without exploiting any monopoly situation that may exist.[177]

## External development partners

External development partners, both bilateral and multilateral, are major non-state actors in LDCs. These partners have contributed not only to fill in the resource gap, but also to enhance policy debates and dialogue, address governance concerns, and develop national capacities for addressing the nations' development challenges.

### Economic and human development challenges

With the introduction of PRSPs, which for all practical purposes have become the medium-term development plans for a number of LDCs, the external development partners have become a major party to policy discussions. On sectoral policy issues in areas of fiscal and trade policies, multilateral and bilateral partners are now more deeply involved. In many LDCs, external development partners are a significant contributor to service delivery. For example, the role played by UNICEF in provisioning of safe water and children's immunization is well-known. Bilateral donors such as Canada, Denmark, Finland, the Netherlands, Norway and Sweden are quite active in the social sectors of many LDCs; bilateral development partners from Japan, the United Kingdom and the United States, meanwhile, actively participate in the physical infrastructure sectors. External development partners are working with national governments and NGOs in

[177] See http://pppue.undp.org.

countries heavily affected by HIV/AIDS to deal with the particularly devastating effects of the epidemic. Their role in environmental sustainability and natural disaster management is also noteworthy. External development partners also cover resource gaps in many LDCs and undertake aid harmonization and co-ordination efforts.

In post-conflict situations, external development partners contribute heavily to restoring services. For example, in Timor-Leste, initial efforts by external development partners have focused on the urgent need to rehabilitate roads, ports, and water and power supply to create a basis for socioeconomic development. As a result of their concerted efforts, road rehabilitation and maintenance work have linked previously isolated communities and created an estimated 300,000 person days of employment. In Afghanistan, to support the rehabilitation of the education system, donors are working in coordination with the government and NGOs to build professional capacity at the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Higher Education. Efforts are addressing the need for training, planning and management activities.

### Governance challenges

In addition to their work responding to economic and human development challenges, external development partners also contribute significantly to addressing LDCs' governance challenges. Both multilateral and bilateral development partners help national governments to design and implement parliamentary reforms, ensure access to justice through judiciary reforms, promote public administration reform and combat corruption. They can also provide vital support for increased dialogue and information about political transition, as has happened in Haiti (see Box 3.11).

## Box 3.11. Support by external development partners towards political transition in Haiti

Throughout much of 2005, preparations were under way in Haiti to elect a new government in general elections scheduled for October, November and December of that year — the first legislative, municipal and presidential elections since the resignation and departure from the country in February 2004 of President Jean-Bertrand Aristide. Among other efforts, the Government of Haiti and the United Nations held a two-day information and discussion workshop for political parties and civil society organizations that was aimed at promoting a peaceful transition in this strife-torn Caribbean nation.

Organized by the government with the support of UNDP, the workshop in July 2005 brought together representatives from all political parties and factions planning to compete in the upcoming elections. It provided a forum for in-depth consideration by the participants of such important issues as the national budget, implementation of the Interim Cooperation Framework (ICF) — which was prepared by the transitional government with the support of the international community — the environment, poverty reduction efforts and the MDGs. Also participating were representatives of civil society organizations and development cooperation agencies.

"With the elections just a few months away and as part of the process of national dialogue, the government with the support of the United Nations system wished to share all available information on the major national issues", declared Gérard Latortue, Prime Minister of the transitional government. "This is part of our efforts to develop the capacity of political actors and of civil society in order to equip them for effectively preparing their programmes and for the proper exercise of state power."

*Source: www.undp.org/dpa/pressrelease/releases/2005/july/prHaiti25260705.htm.*

External development partners have supported public administration reforms in many LDC by supplying knowledge and financial and technical resources, boosting confidence and stimulating new thinking and practices. But innovations can be risky, especially if they are not sufficiently anchored in local conditions and context. For example, introduction of new public management (NPM) solutions into the Pacific LDCs from Australia and New Zealand has been criticized for its excessive demand on absorptive capacity and tendency to crowd out good practices. Service delivery has been overlooked in the quest for greater efficiency in central fiscal management and an externally promoted push for the substitution of the private for the public sector. Consequently, apart from Samoa, local ownership has been lacking and cultural aspects have been seemingly overlooked in other Pacific LDCs.

Bhutan, meanwhile, is a leading example of an LDC that continues to successfully indigenize effective techniques from the outside to achieve customized national strategies for state capacity development. Its efforts reflect an approach to development that seeks to achieve harmony between political and economic forces, the environment and Bhutanese cultural values. As a result, Bhutan, although a more resource-constrained country than many others, has been relatively sucessful in preventing and mitigating corruption in state institutions and the society at large.

External development partners often seek to improve civil servants' performance and motivation by selectively raising ("topping up") some salaries. While this practice is often frowned upon at their headquarters as both distortionary and unsustainable, it is often unavoidable on the ground, especially in the context of capacity-constrained countries. To address this ideological discrepancy, various attempts have been made to bring top ups formally within the pay regime and to identify less distortionary and more sustainable solutions and transparent process.

Support by external development partners can be one viable option to ameliorate severe resource constraints to decentralization in LDCs. However, over-dependence on external aid can also be dangerous. Over-dependence inhibits national ownership of reforms and establishes conditions in which development fails to continue, or even regresses, when donor support is withdrawn. Local commitment, capability and sustainability should be emphasized during project implementation to help avoid backsliding in the future. In Cambodia, for example, it is uncertain whether the capacity and functions currently performed by the multi-donor Partnership for Local Governance Project can be adequately internalized and owned at the provincial and national levels. With a Provincial Investment Fund (PIF) funded entirely by donors, it remains to be seen whether the provincial administration is able to respond to local priorities in the absence of the PIF.

**Local commitment, capability and sustainability should be emphasized during project implementation to help avoid backsliding in the future**

### External development partners and civil society

Partnerships between civil society organizations and international donors and development agencies have become essential for the promotion of peace, sustainable development and democratic governance in LDCs. Civil society groups often play crucial intermediary roles between external development partners and the community; in this role they articulate and explain the needs and demands of people living in poverty and the donors' development priorities. These partnerships have helped create targeted strategies that maximize both the resources and expertise of the donor community.

In recent years, relationships between external development partners and civil society organization have changed. The scope and nature of partnerships have expanded into areas such as advocacy, agenda setting, human rights and poverty alleviation. Civil society organizations have not only implemented many international programmes and aid interventions, but also have served as policy advisors and intervention assistants for donors and development agencies. Civil society in both LDCs and developed countries has contributed "to improve international governance by galvanizing public opinion and pushing their respective governments to take pro-poor policies towards development assistance to LDCs."[178]

External development partners' interest in collaborating with civil society derives from the perception that civil society is critical to hold government officials accountable, promote social change and increase effective outreach to and participation of vulnerable groups. Moreover, external development partners now accept that peace, development and democracy cannot be imposed from the outside;[179] instead, they need to be created from within. With this in mind, donors' support of local organizations contributes to expanded participation in and ownership and sustainability of development programmes.

External development partners' collaboration with civil society organizations has been essential in peace-building and post-conflict reconstruction efforts where state institutions are weak or non-existent. Civil society's experience in areas such as advocacy, service provision and policy-making at the community level is helpful during peace-building processes. In post-conflict situations, development intervention from the international community benefits from alliances with civil society organizations that work to expand political participation, promote ethnic harmony and reconciliation and create hope for the future.

International development partners can contribute to the development of civil society organizations in LDCs in three major areas described below: financial resources, capacity-building, and consultation and collaboration.

**International development partners can contribute to the development of civil society organizations in LDCs in three major areas described below: financial resources, capacity-building, and consultation and collaboration**

▸ **Financial resources.** External development partners can provide the necessary financial means for civil society organizations to effectively fulfil their missions. Examples from LDCs indicate that strict accountability mechanisms and monitoring requirements should be applied to both external development partners and recipient organizations to ensure transparent use of funds. Both funders and recipients should keep in mind, however, that national and local organizations should respond to national needs and interests even though they receive funds from abroad. Furthermore, donors should think in broader terms. A common criticism of international aid to civil society is that international donors tend to support advocacy groups that represent only a narrow slice of a country's civil society. In such situations, support is often provided only to groups that focus on issues considered important by donors, and not necessarily on groups that have developed from locally defined interests and demands.[180] This situation creates problems related to ownership and sustainability of the programmes executed by these organizations.

---

[178] Ambassador and Permanent Representative of the United Republic of Tanzania to the United Nations H.E. Mr. Augustin Mahiga, speaking at a briefing on governance among LDCs Ambassadors jointly organized by UNDP and UN-OHRLLS, New York, 26 September 2005.

[179] See UNDP, "Experience from the Field: UNDP – CSO Partnerships for Conflict Prevention," New York, UNDP BRSP –BCPR, July 2005.

[180] See Christopher Sabatini, "Who Do International Donors Support in the Name of Civil Society," 2001, pp. 3-4; Thomas Carothers, "Aiding Democracy Abroad: The Learning Curve," Washington, DC, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

- **Capacity-building.** Given the importance of civil society for the achievement of MDGs, it is important that civil society in LDCs is given the opportunity to develop expand; today, civil society tends to be weak or tiny (or both) in many of these countries. External development partners can assist in developing civil society capacity by providing local organizations with skills and facilities necessary to fulfil their functions effectively. "While exact content and extent of such efforts will naturally depend on the national context, capacity-building could encompass the facilitation of exchange of experience and expertise among national and international NGOs, training, or the provision of NGOs with those technical means necessary to fulfil their mission effectively." [181]
- **Consultation and collaboration.** It is essential that external development partners and civil society organizations consult and collaborate with each other when seeking to achieve common goals. External development partners can facilitate exchanges between different parts of society and be instrumental in creating the conditions for strengthening civil society. These objectives can be achieved by, for example, discussing and negotiating with national governments as to appropriate legal and regulatory frameworks, including government guarantees of fundamental freedoms such as freedom of expression and assembly. They can also play important roles in highlighting the need for comprehensive access to information laws. Moreover, it is important that members of the donor community avoid duplication of efforts and unconstructive competition, in terms of both donor programmes and support for national civil society organizations.

An empowered participatory society and pluralism of opinions is important for pressuring the legitimate and accountable functioning of government. Increased participation of the broader society will help ensure better accountability on the part of the political leadership and the state institutions. Emphasizing greater participation contributes to democratic governance not just from the perspective of legitimacy, but also in terms of the effectiveness of public policies and the efficient use of resources. The availability of opportunities generated by private-sector initiatives that characterize a vibrant society gives people the opportunity to use their energy in a creative manner and to gain a stake in ongoing efforts to promote development.

**Development results from the creative interaction between various agents of change: the State, civil society, the private sector and external development partners.**

Development results from the creative interaction between various agents of change: the State, civil society, the private sector and external development partners. Interaction empowers all social actors that influence the direction and content of development policy and progress. At the same time though, interaction requires a systematic and sustainable structure with clear rules of engagements among the actors. This issue is addressed in Chapter Four.

[181] "Donor Support to Civil Society Organizations as a Means to Reduce Corruption," Utstein Anti-corruption Resource Center. See www.u4.no/helpdesk/helpdesk/queries/query34.cfm.

CHAPTER FOUR

# Rule of Law, human rights and access to justice

# Introduction

As stressed throughout this Report, human rights and human development are profoundly linked to each other and lie at the heart of the MDGs. When advanced together, they enforce each other — by expanding people's capabilities and protecting their fundamental rights and freedoms.[182] Human development is better achieved when rights-related issues are addressed, including equality, non-discrimination, participation, inclusion, accountability, social justice, and international solidarity and cooperation.[183] Moreover, human rights provide an essential normative and objective instrument to deal with the inherent power questions lying beneath many of the current development problems.

Given their concern with human freedom and dignity, human rights principles and norms set clear entitlements for all human beings and obligations for States[184]. Therefore, the promotion and protection of human rights as well as the achievement of human development are possible only when States establish transparent, accountable systems of governance, grounded in the rule of law, and provide access to justice for all members of society, paying special attention to the most vulnerable groups in society. There are different mechanisms through which the State guarantees human rights and the rule of law. These include: 1) laws consistent with international human rights standards; 2) institutional separation of powers, which includes an independent judiciary; and 3) effective functioning of courts, judiciary and law enforcement as well as independent human rights institutions or ombudsman offices.[185]

**Human development is better achieved when rights-related issues are addressed, including equality, non-discrimination, participation, inclusion, accountability, social justice, and international solidarity and cooperation**

Respect for human rights and the rule of law promotes an empowered and participatory society that can counter exploitative political and economic interests in society. For this to occur, it is important that norms are known to all, applied in law and reality, and that mechanisms for redress are in place. Although the primary guarantor of human rights is the State, human rights and the rule of law cannot be realized without the commitment of society to these norms and rules as well.[186] Interactions among individuals and groups in society should therefore reflect these principles.

This chapter begins with an assessment of LDCs' commitment to upholding international human rights instruments. It then focuses on national human rights institutions, followed by a review of constitutions and laws in these countries. Also addressed in this chapter are issues related to dual justice systems, access to justice, innovative approaches in judiciary systems and reform processes, and criminal-justice systems.

---

[182] UNDP, "Human Rights in UNDP: Practice Note," April 2005, p. 7.

[183] Ibid., p. 5.

[184] Every particular right entails the existence of those who hold legal entitlement to it (all human beings without exception are right-holders or claim holders) and those who are under a duty to take appropriate measures to uphold the right (the duty-bearers, which usually refers to the State).

[185] UNDP, *Human Rights in UNDP: Practice Note,* April 2005; UNDP, *Access to Justice: Practice Note,* March 2004.

[186] This is an important factor that has been often ignored by donors. In "Promoting the Rule of Law Abroad: The Problem of Knowledge" (Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, No. 34, January 2003, p. 9), Thomas Carothers noted, that donors' promotion of the rule of law often took a simplistic approach by considering that "a country achieves the rule of law by reshaping its key institutions to match those of countries that are considered to have the rule of law—and quickly ran into deeply embedded resistance to change in many countries."

# Respecting international human rights instruments in LDCs

Although much more needs to be done, there is evidence of the advancement of human rights in LDCs. Over the past decade, many LDCs have ratified the major international human rights instruments, as shown in figure 4.1. Some LDCs have incorporated human rights provisions into their constitutions while others have established mechanisms such as national human rights institutions to promote human rights at the domestic level.

In Africa, for example, LDCs have benefited from an expansion in the normative and institutional architecture of the African regional human rights system over the last two decades. This period has seen important human rights developments such as the inauguration of the African Committee of Experts on the Rights and Welfare of the Child of 1990; the entry into force of the Protocol to the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights on the Establishing of an African Court on Human and Peoples' Rights of 1998; and the adoption by the Assembly of the African Union, on 11 July 2003, of the Protocol to the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights of Women in Africa and the African Union Convention on Preventing and Combating Corruption.[187]

LDCs in other parts of the world have also taken some positive steps toward the promotion of human rights through regional initiatives. For example, in 1986 a group of experts from Arab nations composed a Draft Charter for Human Rights in the Arab Homeland that is designed to apply to all Arab countries (including Arab LDCs).[188] This draft included provisions for the protection of civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, as well as collective rights for the Arab people. Eight years later, the Arab League sponsored the drafting of the Arab Charter for Human Rights, which sought

**Figure 4.1. LDCs ratifications of major international human rights instruments**

- ICESCR = International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights
- ICCPR = International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights
- CERD = Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination
- CEDAW = Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women
- CAT = Convention against Torture
- CRC = Convention on the Rights of the Child

*Source: United Nations, "General Assembly, Human Rights, Poverty and Governance in the Least Developed Countries: Rights-based Approaches Towards a New Framework of Cooperation," A/CON.191/BP/8, New York, 13 May 2001.*

[187] Paul T. Zeleza and Philip J. McConnaughay, eds., *Human Rights, the Rule of Law and Development in Africa*, University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.

[188] UNDP uses the category Arab States to refer to 17 countries in the Middle East and North Africa. Among those Arab States, the following are LDCs: Djibouti, Somalia, Sudan and Yemen. See www.undp.org/regions/arabstates.

to correct many of the deficiencies of the previous charter. However, the more recent charter itself lacks some of the protections of international human rights law, such as freedom of expression, belief and association, as well as language specifically calling for the elimination of discrimination against women and children.[189]

Despite such advancements, implementation and enforcement of agreed-to norms has been uneven. In many LDCs, human rights continue to be abused and highly neglected, especially the rights of those from the most vulnerable groups in society — women, children, minorities and indigenous peoples. Discriminatory laws and practices are still present in many LDCs, and in some cases there is a clear lack of political will to address this situation.

Human rights also have been hampered by the fact that in many LDCs international human rights instruments have not been integrated into national constitutions and laws. The ratification of international legal instruments would likely spark real progress in understanding, acknowledging, promoting and protecting human rights at the national and local level — especially if key norms were added to constitutions and legal frameworks. Although necessary for the protection of human rights, ratifying treaties and amending and enacting legislation are not sufficient; what is also needed is a commitment to implement and enforce such principles and norms.

Furthermore, the protection of rights in LDCs is frequently limited by the absence of real separation of power, the lack of check and balances and the institutional weaknesses in the justice sector. More specifically, problems arise from deficient enforcement (even when laws exist) and insufficient awareness of legal human rights guarantees — as well as the absence, intentionally or not, of political will to address human rights violations. Moreover, LDCs have had to confront the challenges of integrating human rights into traditional justice systems, solidifying the values of human dignity and equality in post-conflict settings, and ensuring the protection of human rights for minority groups, notably for women.

Many LDCs, as well as many countries throughout the world, have difficulty in appropriately reporting their progress on human rights adherence in accordance with the various human rights covenants. These reports are not considered to be a government priority in some LDCs; in others, substandard or nonexistent report stems from a lack of expertise on human rights. Furthermore, the reports are often treated as a one-time assignment, rather than an ongoing record of the development of a human rights culture in a given country. In some cases, LDCs do not have the capacity to undertake the workload required of reporting, which demands extensive research and detailed documentation, and lack the financial resources to fund this process. In many countries, different actors participate in this reporting procedure, especially human rights NGOs. However, civil society in some LDCs also faces capacity obstacles that prevent its engagement in producing a record of domestic human rights practices.

There is need at the global level to adopt a monitoring approach that can identify human rights abuses and set in motion machineries for immediate remedial measures. This is especially appropriate for countries that have signed international human rights instruments with reservations. As noted by a legal expert, Dieter Weiss, "Monitoring

[189] See UNDP, "Arab Human Development Report 2004: Towards Freedom in the Arab World," New York, 2005, pp. 76-77.

and evaluation of the legislating process deserves international attention and support. For Benin, Ghana [not an LDC] and Togo, NGO activists have established an 'Observatoire de Suivi de la Situation du Droit' for regular assessment, lobbying, political reform pressure, collection of credible information for research and the media, and the formulation of workable criteria to measure the transformation of international conventions into national law. The NGO Center Africa Obota has set up an evaluation network in another five West African countries: Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire [not an LDC], Mali, Niger and Senegal."[190] The monitoring should not stop here, though; it needs to go a little bit further in determining how and whether courts and the governments have paid heed to the tenets of international human rights instruments that are part of the domestic legislation.

## Strengthening national human rights institutions

Since the 1990s, many LDCs have expressed their commitment towards the promotion of human rights through the creation of national human rights institutions (NHRIs). It is important to note a conceptual distinction between NHRIs and ombudsmen. NHRIs refers to national bodies with general human rights mandates, while ombudsmen are national institutions mandated mainly to handle cases of poor or improper administration in the public sector. NHRIs are specialized and autonomous institutions created by law to incorporate "international human rights principles into the national political discourses, state structures and practices."[191] Although their achievements have varied across countries, many NHRIs in LDCs have contributed to increase the capacity and expertise needed to incorporate and promote international human rights standards into domestic legislations, public policies and practices.[192]

**many NHRIs in LDCs have contributed to increase the capacity and expertise needed to incorporate and promote international human rights standards into domestic legislations, public policies and practices**

Table 4.1 focuses on the status of national institutions in LDCs that are accredited by a international coordinating committee of national institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights in LDCs. NHRIs have been endorsed by the United Nations since 1946[193] because they constitute an important mechanism for bridging government and civil society efforts in the promotion of human rights — despite the fact that they are funded by the State and most often created by parliaments, yet are supposed to function as independent and autonomous bodies.

In 1991, the first International Workshop on National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights developed a set of recommendations and principles known as the Paris Principles, which delineate the criteria for the recognition and accreditation of NHRIs. The Paris Principles were adopted and confirmed by the Commission on Human Rights in 1992 and the General Assembly in 1993. Broadly speaking, the Paris Principles set the following characteristics for the accreditation of NHRIs:

- a broadly defined mandate with emphasis on the national implementation of interna-

[190] See Dieter Weiss, "The Law, Legal Certainty and Empowerment, the Concept of Law within a Cultural Context," Institute of International Economics, Berlin Free University, Germany, 2002. Online: www.inwent.org/ef-texte/law/rep.htm#52.

[191] Danish Institute for Human Rights; online: www.humanrights.dk/frontpage/short/.

[192] See ICHRP (International Council on Human Rights Policy), "National Human Rights Institutions: Impact Assessment Indicators," Geneva, 2005.

[193] ECOSOC Resolution 2/9 of 1946.

tional human rights standards, which include a number of responsibilities;

- a mandate to perform the following core functions:
  - monitor the human rights situation
  - advise the State on the compliance with international human rights standards
  - cooperate with regional and international human rights organizations
  - educate and inform in the field of human rights
  - hear and consider individual complaints and petitions (optional);
- established by legislative means;
- independent of the government decision-making process;
- pluralistic representation of civil society and vulnerable groups in the governing bodies;[194]

NHRIs have faced many challenges in LDCs and elsewhere. An important limitation to their effectiveness has been the fact that many of them lack the power to address the grievances of those whose human rights have been affected. In some countries, a special human rights court has been created as part of the mainstream judiciary with the intention of providing NHRIs a venue in which human rights cases can be pursued. Another common challenge is the struggle to guarantee their independence and credibility vis-à-vis government control as well as to be able to mediate between the State and civil society.

Studies examining the role of NHRIs show that leadership has played a key role in guaranteeing their real impact in the domestic promotion and protection of human rights at the national level.[195] The efficiency of NHRIs has been compromised when their leaders are unwilling or unable to protest against human rights violations, either because they fear reprisals or because the executive controls them. Despite the challenges noted above, however, it is evident that many NHRIs in LDCs are highly committed to (and effective at guaranteeing) the promotion of human rights not only nationally, but also at the regional level. They also have shown high levels of credibility, legitimacy and professionalism.

**Across all LDCs, Africa stands out as the region where NHRIs have been most widely established and have had a more successful role.**

Across all LDCs, Africa stands out as the region where NHRIs have been most widely established and have had a more successful role. Out of a total of 14 NHRIs in Africa, six are fully accredited[196] — in Malawi Niger, Rwanda, Senegal, Togo and Uganda — and six are accredited with reservations (in Burkina Faso, Chad, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Madagascar, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zambia). Although not all NHRIs in African LDCs conformed to the Paris Principles, the establishment of such bodies by most countries indicates the growing acceptance of this type of instrument for the promotion of human rights in the region. In Asia, Nepal is the only LDC that has an NHRI accredited by the UN Human Rights Commission (a total of 13 have been accredited in the Asia-Pacific region).[197] Positive change is occurring in the region, however. In recent years both Afghanistan[198] and Maldives have created human rights commissions, and Cambodia is considering establishing a NHRI. (Currently, there are no UN-accredited NHRIs in LDCs in the Caribbean, Pacific and

[194] Danish Institute for Human Rights; online: www.humanrights.dk/frontpage/short/.

[195] Danish Institute for Human Rights, "Country Reports: Supporting National Human Rights Institutes — a Strategic Niche for UNDP?" October 2004.

[196] Accreditations of NHRIs are done when these institutions conform to the standards set by the Paris Principles.

[197] At the same time, however, Nepal's NHRI has encountered operational difficulties due to conflict situations and states of emergency, both of which have restricted its ability to carry out core functions across the country and its independence.

[198] See www.aihrc.org.af/.

**Table 4.1. Status (as of May 2005) of national human rights institutions in LDCs**

| National institution | Status | Year(s) reviewed |
|---|---|---|
| AFRICA | | |
| Malawi: Malawi Human Rights Commission | A | 2000 |
| Niger: Niger Commission Nationale des Droits de L'homme et des Libertés Fondamentales | A | 2001, 2002 |
| Rwanda : National Commission for Human Rights | A | 2001 |
| Senegal: Comité Sénégalais des Droits de L'homme | A | 2000 |
| Togo : National Commission for Human Rights | A | 2000 |
| Uganda: Uganda Human Rights Commission | A | 2001 |
| Chad: Commission Nationale des Droits de L'homme | A ® | 2000 |
| Democratic Republic of the Congo: Observatoire National des Droits de L'homme | A ® | 2005 |
| Madagascar: Human Rights Commission | A ® | 2000, 2002 |
| United Republic of Tanzania: National Human Rights Commission | A ® | 2003 |
| Zambia: Zambian Human Rights Commission | A ® | 2003 |
| Burkina Faso: Commission Nationale des Droits de L'Homme | B | 2002, 2005 |
| Benin: Commission Béninoise des Droits de L'homme | C | 2000 |
| Mauritania: Commissariat aux Droits de L'Homme, a Lutte contre la Pauvreté et l'Insertion | — | — |
| ASIA AND THE PACIFIC | | |
| Nepal: National Human Rights Commission of Nepal | A | 2001, 2002 |
| Afghanistan: Afghan Independent Human Rights Commission | — | — |
| Maldives: Human Rights Commission of Maldives | — | — |
| THE AMERICAS | | |
| Haiti: Office de la Protection du Citoyen | — | — |

Classifications for accreditations:
7 Compliance with the Paris Principles
A ®: Accreditation with reserve — granted where preliminary analysis indicates compliance with the Paris Principles, but insufficient documentation is submitted to confer A status.
B: Observer status: Not fully in compliance with the Paris Principles or insufficient information provided to make a determination.
C: Non-compliant with the Paris Principles.

*Sources: www.nhri.net/pdf/ICC%20Accredited%20NIs%202005.pdf; www.nhri.net/NationaldataList.asp.*

Middle East regions.) Many LDCs also have parliamentary bodies specializing in human rights.[199]

NHRIs are important because they have the potential of promoting and advancing human rights by putting human rights standards in the national policy agenda; proposing national legislation that conforms to international human rights standards; monitoring and documenting human rights abuses; and educating and informing about human rights.

[199] Information on human rights legislative bodies can be found in the country profiles at the end of this report.

## Constitutions and laws

In many LDCs, reforming existing laws and constitutions has been a common method to enhance and promote democratic governance, especially in post-conflict settings where constitution-making has become an essential element for laying the formal foundation for a State.[200] The capacity limitations of LDCs may limit their ability to reach out to and engage the entire population in constitution formulation. In such situations, the presence of a strong civil society is a valuable asset. Including civil society in the constitution-making process creates a closer relationship between those in power and the public and enables civil society organizations to engage citizens on an issue pertinent to people nationwide. Increasing participation requires the commitment of the government and civil society organizations to educate and inform the citizenry about the constitution-related developments.[201] In post-conflict settings where civil society is not strong, a pluralistic political system is difficult to achieve immediately. Therefore, the process of constitution-making may first require an interim or transitional constitution that will affirm the values of openness and inclusion.

**Including civil society in the constitution-making process creates a closer relationship between those in power and the public**

Participation in the constitution-making process has taken many forms in various LDCs, and has extended far beyond merely ratifying a constitutional text by referendum.[202] Afghanistan and Eritrea adopted distinct approaches to participatory constitution-making, yet each was successful and transparent in its goals of encouraging citizen engagement and laying the framework for open, inclusive societies that respect the rule of law and human rights for all citizens.

In post-conflict Afghanistan, a period of public consultations, carried out by the Constitutional Commission, was incorporated into the constitution-making process to make it more inclusive and participative.[203] The Constitution Review Commission (CRC) established regional offices in Kabul, Kanduz, Mazar-e-Sharif, Bamyan, Herat, Gardez, Jalalabad and Kandahar, as well as in Pakistan and Iran to include Afghan refugees in the process. The consultation process consisted of two stages. The first one consisted of raising national awareness and education on the importance of the new constitution in the nation-building process. In the second stage, the CRC actively sought the input of Afghans from all groups and regions and considered their concerns when incorporating changes into the draft document. More than 150,000 people participated in 523 gatherings in which they openly put forward opinions. Tens of thousands of questionnaires were distributed and more than 80,000 were answered and returned to the

[200] See United Nations, "The rule of Law and Transitional Justice in Conflict and Post-conflict Societies — Report of the Secretary-General," 23 August 2004, S/2004/616; UNDP Oslo Governance Center, "Exploring the Paths toward Peace and Human Development," *Update*, July 2004; UNDP, "Evaluation of Afghanistan's State-building Process from a Human Security Perspective," *Afghanistan Human Development Report 2004: Security with Human Face*, Chapter Five.

[201] USAID Bureau for Africa, Office of Sustainable Development, "African Voices, A Newsletter on Democracy and Governance in Africa," Vol. 6, No. 3, Fall 1997, p. 4.

[202] Hassen Ebrahim, *Constitution-Making in Southern Africa — Challenges for the New Millennium*, 9-11 May 2002, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.

[203] See Constitutional Commission of Afghanistan, *The Constitution-Making Process in Afghanistan*, 10 March 2003; Babar Shah, *The Constitution Process in Afghanistan*, Institute of Strategic Studies (ISS), Islamabad, Pakistan, 2004, online: www.issi.org.pk/strategic_studies_htm/2004/no_1/article/4a.htm; Bernett R. Rubin, "Crafting A Constitution for Afghanistan", *Journal for Democracy*, Vol. 15, No. 13, July 2004; Larry P. Goodson, "Afghanistan in 2004: Electoral Progress and an Opium Boom", *Asian Survey*, Vol. 45, Issue 1, 2005, pp. 88-97.

CRC. Some 6,000 written proposals and 17,000 verbal opinions from meetings were also submitted for consideration. A report was also published by the CRC outlining the extensive public consultation process.[204] The CRC completed its work in five months, and the final draft was made public for further comments and response before it was presented to the Loya Jirga (the national tribal council).

In Eritrea, the Constitutional Commission of Eritrea, formed by the government in 1994, was given a mandate to create a constitution for the newly independent nation. Almost half the members of the constitutional reform commission were women, and all nine Eritrean ethnic groups were represented. In the early part of the constitution-making process, Eritrea launched civic education campaigns that consisted of producing and dispersing documents describing the constitution-making process to the public in the national language as well as local dialects. Furthermore, as part of a four-part plan to educate the public about the importance and meaning of the constitution, approximately 400 trainers mobilized to educate the public about the process, targeting illiterate members of society with songs, poems, plays, stories and radio broadcasts. They succeeded in reaching more than half a million people.[205]

The public was also engaged during each phase leading up to the creation of Rwanda's constitution in 2002. According to official documents, the Action Plan of the Constitutional Commission sought to achieve "the training and sensitization of the population about the Constitution; the consultation of the population on the content of the Constitution; the writing and validation of the draft text of the Constitution; [and] the referendum on the text of the Constitution as approved by the Parliament."[206] Members of the drafting committee spent six months travelling around the country, educating Rwandans about the constitution and soliciting their opinions.

In some other LDCs, however, constitution-making processes were not transparent and did not engage the public at multiple levels of constitution creation. The result was rejection of the text in ratification referendums.

In addition to a strong constitution that establishes the framework for the rule of law and respect for human rights, a country's laws must reflect a commitment to these norms as well. According to the World Bank, "The existence of an adequate set of rules is one of the main pillars of the rule of law."[207] LDCs confront many logistical, human and financial capacity constraints in their efforts to create an adequate set of laws. Logistical impediments such as the lack of adequate office space and equipment for legislation drafting pose obstacles for many LDCs. Even when these resources exist, lack of coordination mechanisms among various institutions that must take part in the legislation drafting process can prevent their efficient allocation and use.

One of the greatest challenges to establishing an adequate set of rules is that the lawmaking process is often long and confusing, and the law-adoption procedure is neither systematic nor coordinated. A convoluted procedure prevents the public from easily understanding the laws and therefore adhering to them. Furthermore, capacity limita-

**One of the greatest challenges to establishing an adequate set of rules is that the lawmaking process is often long and confusing, and the law-adoption procedure is neither systematic nor coordinated.**

[204] "The Constitution Process," online: www.unama-afg.org/constitution/draft.

[205] Hassen Ebrahim, *Constitution-Making in Southern Africa — Challenges for the New Millennium*, 9-11 May 2002, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.

[206] See www.cjcr.gov.rw/eng/actionplancjc.PDF.

[207] World Bank, "Cambodia — Legal and Judicial Reform Project, East Asia and Pacific Region," Project ID #: KHPE71289.

tions can be particularly acute among those responsible for drafting laws. Many LDCs suffer from a shortage of lawyers, and many officials responsible for law-drafting functions lack adequate legal experience to understand the complexities of formulating and implementing legislation, particularly in the area of complex economic transactions. A clear understanding of these procedures is essential to create laws that provide an attractive environment for foreign investors; therefore, legal training is needed for legislators, ministers, lawyers and other governmental officials. Some LDCs, such as Cambodia (with the assistance of the World Bank), have established legal reform programmes to provide legal training to legislators responsible for the creation of laws. Law courses are being offered by the Faculty of Laws of the University of Phnom Penh, the National Economics Institute, the National Institute of Management and the Legal Reform Unit of the Council of Ministers (LRU).[208] These capacity-development initiatives ensure a transfer of knowledge about law-making to the appropriate legislators and empower them to develop a culturally appropriate system of laws. Furthermore, they limit the need for or influence of legislation-preparation efforts that are donor-driven, and which therefore often do not take account of specific country conditions.

Another dimension of legislation drafting is that laws (and constitutions) must be congruent with international human rights covenants, and the norms of these covenants must be integrated into domestic legislation. Ensuring such developments helps increase the likelihood of adherence to these crucial norms.[209] Among LDCs, some countries (such as Senegal) follow the "monist" integration approach, whereby upon ratification or accession to an international covenant, the treaty automatically becomes part of the domestic legislation of the country. Other LDCs (such as Zambia) have pursued the "dualist" approach, which requires that treaties are explicitly incorporated into domestic law subsequent to ratification. The dualist approach can be problematic because many countries are slow to amend their constitutions and bring domestic law into conformity with the requirements of international human rights covenants. Often, the norms reflected in human rights treaties challenge the status quo in domestic legislation, and many governments are reluctant to rectify this imbalance. Therefore, although many LDCs have ratified numerous human rights covenants, the norms espoused in these treaties are still not always integrated into the domestic legislation — and the nations remain only nominally in adherence to the covenants.

**although many LDCs have ratified numerous human rights covenants, the norms espoused in these treaties are still not always integrated into the domestic legislation**

Examples of LDCs undertaking parliamentary reform measures to bring their constitutions into adherence with human rights covenants include Senegal — which enacted the Amendment of the Criminal Code in order to be compliant with CEDAW and CRC — and Zambia, which commissioned the Affiliation and Maintenance of Children Act to become compatible with CRC.

## Rule of law and justice

The existence of good laws and constitutions does not mean they are enforced. Indeed, legislation and regulations are meaningless without an efficient and effective judicial sys-

[208] Ibid., p. 5.

[209] Christof Heyns and Frans Vilijoen, "The Impact of the United Nations Human Rights Treaties on the Domestic Level," *Human Rights Quarterly*, 23, 2001, p. 487.

tem to enforce them. LDCs must have institutions that promote the rule law not only on paper, but also in practice. This requires a real separation of powers among state institutions that promote accountability. It is essential also to strengthen the judiciary and to guarantee access to justice for all citizens, especially the most vulnerable individuals in society, and to create a criminal-justice system that serves and protects citizens.

### Dual systems of justice

Traditional/customary and statutory/modern justice systems coexist in many LDCs. Coexisting systems often create unnecessary legal complexity and have caused problems related to legitimacy, transparency, consistency and accessibility.[210]

A so-called customary system of justice is governed by traditional rules and administered by traditional leaders or social institutions and norms. In comparison, a statutory system is governed by modern law, supported by documentary evidence and administered by the State. It has been argued that traditional mechanisms of justice are often more accessible to poor and disadvantaged people and may have the potential to provide speedy, affordable and meaningful remedies to them. Seeking justice through customary courts is popular in many LDCs because modern courts are seen to have long processes, high costs and poor access. In Bangladesh, for example, an estimated 60-70 percent of local disputes are solved by traditional systems of alternative dispute resolution, the Salish mediation councils, because the formal legal system is perceived as excessively expensive, time consuming and less accessible for disadvantaged groups.[211] However, traditional mechanisms are not always effective and do not necessarily result in justice.[212] Some customary systems have been charged with being discriminatory toward certain groups (especially women) and may not adhere to universal human rights principles and law.

**Seeking justice through customary courts is popular in many LDCs because modern courts are seen to have long processes, high costs and poor access**

Modern courts also present problems regarding access to justice in many LDCs. They generally operate in the national official language, which may not be the language of the majority of the people or of members of significantly large ethnic groups. Formal legal and regulatory systems are generally weak and underdeveloped because the judicial system has insufficient resources and skills to enforce the law and lacks transparency and consistency in its decisions. In some LDCs, statutory justice systems depend largely on foreign resources to carry out investigations because they do not have the resources to undertake these activities themselves.

However, parallel systems of justice are often problematic because the traditional and statutory justice systems usually are not adequately integrated and their spheres of influence are not clearly delineated. For example, most of the constitutions of Pacific LDCs acknowledge the special position of traditions and customs, empowering traditional chiefs and elders to dispense justice. Yet in most countries the roles of these chiefs in light of the duality of the judicial systems are not clearly defined.

---

[210] See Dieter Weiss, "The Law, Legal Certainty and Empowerment, the Concept of Law within a Cultural Context," Institute of International Economics, Berlin Free University, Germany, 2002. Online: www.inwent.org/ef-texte/law/rep.htm#t52.

[211] UNDP, "Programming for Justice: Access for All. A Practitioner's Guide to a Human Rights-Based Approach to Access to Justice," Bangkok, UNDP, 2005, p. 100.

[212] UNDP, "Practice Note: Access to Justice," March 2004, p. 4.

Customary laws are often in direct contradiction to statutory laws. A common example centres on land rights.[213] Small farmers in many African LDCs have long held land under customary tenure (see Box 4.1), but they risk losing it to those who acquire it under statutory law or through direct state intervention. Often, these conversions are done through clandestine process so that those affected have no say in the transfer of lands. Countries with a history of settler colonization face particularly extensive tenure problems stemming from conflicting land entitlements and exploitation by traditional and government authorities that have resulted in insecurity.

## Box 4.1. Malawi and Mozambique: Land rights

The security of land tenure, which is the system of institutions that govern access to and the use of land, is fundamental for achieving sustainable development in southern Africa. Land tenure security provides farmers with individual rights to farm plots and secure collective rights to common pool resources upon which whole villages depend.

The Governments of Malawi and Mozambique have responded to long histories of land tenure conflicts through the adoption of the National Land Policy and Land Law, respectively. Both new land laws address land alienation resulting from the transition from customary to leasehold tenure, and recognize independent land rights for women.

In Malawi, the National Land Policy was adopted in January of 2002. The policy elevates customary land tenure to common law status, recognizing customary land as private land. The policy provides for the registration and titling of customary land to provide security for owners of customary land claims. Furthermore, land is registered in the names of all members of the nuclear family, regardless of matrilineal or patrilineal society customs, in order to establish equal rights for men and women in matters involving land inheritance. Additionally, village land committees and village and land tribunals have been established to democratize the process of village land allocation and make it more transparent.

In Mozambique, the parliament passed the Land Law and Regulation in 1997. It establishes that land is the property of the State and cannot be sold or mortgaged. The law recognizes customary land rights, requires the consultation and participation of local communities in land alienation, allows local communities to apply for a land use title and grants women land rights. It strengthens the ability of smallholders to defend their rights when confronted with competition for land from commercial interests. Furthermore, Mozambique has already harmonized its land law with marriage and inheritance laws. To ensure the success of implementing this law, approximately 200 civil society organizations initiated the Land Campaign to inform local communities about the new land bill. This campaign informed producers, operators and businessmen about their rights and duties according to the Land Law, and has had the effect of empowering citizens.

*Sources: Economic Commission for Africa, "Land Tenure Systems and Sustainable Development in Southern Africa," ECA/SA/EGM.Land/2003/2, ECA Southern Africa Office, Lusaka, Zambia, December 2003; Laurel L. Rose, "Women's Strategies for Customary Land Access in Swaziland and Malawi: A Comparative Study," Africa Today, Vol. 49, No. 2, pp. 123-149*

Dual systems of justice have been particularly disempowering for women. Often, under statutory law, women have the right to own land but seldom have the resources to do so. Under customary law, they have the secondary right to land tenure as a wife, but they lose their right to the land as soon as the marriage ends (regardless of the reason)

[213] See Economic Commission for Africa, "Land Tenure Systems and Sustainable Development in Southern Africa," ECA/SA/EGM.Land/2003/2, ECA Southern Africa Office, Lusaka, Zambia, December 2003.

Furthermore, women often are subjected to discrimination and violence when trying to access their land, inheritance and other social and economic rights. While statutory laws in most countries have tried to address these challenges, they generally have stopped short of achieving any significant improvements. The main problem is that the constitutions of many countries are contradictory in nature themselves, allowing for customary/religious law to prevail in personal and family matters (with the consent of the parties), regardless of the law's discriminatory nature. Even in constitutions in which statutory laws have greater heft, enforcement is often weak; given time and financial constraints, many women do not seek formal legal redress from these judicial systems. For example, in some African LDCs, although constitutions provide for affirmative action measures to correct historical imbalances of power, they also defer to customary practices in areas of marriage, inheritance, succession and property rights, which can be discriminatory against women.

In addition, dual systems have charged with being ineffective in many instances because plaintiffs opportunistically appeal to both systems in hope of obtaining a ruling that is favourable to their interests. For example, tenure security at times is dependent on a smallholder's good relationship with the chief or other traditional authority figure. (The current situation is not completely dire: Samoa and Vanuatu, for example, have effectively implemented new initiatives to address complex problems of customary land disputes in an efficient manner.)

The conflicting and often contradictory nature of dual justice systems has caused many citizens to perceive their traditional cultures and values as incongruent with the principles and structures of liberal democracy, especially the desirability of separation of powers. Therefore, integrating traditional and modern modes of governance may encourage broader acceptance of legislative roles and systems, build trust and legitimacy in participatory democracy, and tap into local knowledge (see Box 4.2).

**integrating traditional and modern modes of governance may encourage broader acceptance of legislative roles and systems, build trust and legitimacy in participatory democracy, and tap into local knowledge**

In several LDCs in the Asia-Pacific region, for example, working with traditional local institutions of government has helped to increase civil society members' understanding of the democratic system and legislative process. It has also given them an opportunity to educate citizens about the democratic system, which has increased their willingness to participate in its institutions.[214] For example, in November 2001 Bhutan began drafting a constitution that would develop a unique political system incorporating elements of Western democracy while drawing on Bhutan's ancient traditions and culture.[215] Similarly, tapping into existing traditional governmental structures assisted the new government in Timor-Leste in setting conditions for a more stable transition from a post-conflict situation to an inclusive society.[216]

[214] John K. Johnson and Robert Nakamura, "Concept Paper on Legislatures and Good Governance," 1999, pp. 25-28.

[215] Patrick Keuleers, *Governance in the Least Developed Countries in Asia and Pacific*, Bangkok, 2004, p. 10.

[216] UNDP, "Challenges to Democracy," 2004.

## Box 4.2. Rwanda: Innovative mechanisms in the search for justice

In the aftermath of the 1994 genocide in Rwanda, efforts began to determine how best to render justice to society's victims and perpetrators and to restore peace and trust to the public. At one end of the spectrum, the UN Security Council created the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR) to try genocide perpetrators. At the same time, and in recognition of the often slow pace of formal mechanisms, Rwanda has also used the "gacaca," a community-based system of alternative justice.

The ICTR's mandate is to prosecute those responsible for the genocide and other violations of humanitarian law committed in 1994. It has made significant strides in interpreting and giving substance to international human rights law; it was, for instance, the first international tribunal to interpret the definition of genocide as defined in the International Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. Additionally, for the first time in history, the ICTR defined rape as a crime of genocide, as long as this violation is committed with the intent to destroy a particular group. Furthermore, by working with the ICTR, other African LDCs have demonstrated their conviction to the establishment of the rule of law in Africa. For example, Mali and Benin have signed agreements with the ICTR to provide prison facilities for genocide perpetrators.

In 1998, the Government of Rwanda proposed using gacaca to judge the 120,000 perpetrators and collaborators of the 1994 genocide who awaited trial in the formal justice system. The gacaca system emphasizes public involvement in rendering justice to the accused. It provides a forum for witnesses, survivors and assumed perpetrators to debate about what happened during the genocide with the goal of establishing the truth and identifying the victims and the guilty. In March 2001, the "gacaca law" was adopted, after which the government created approximately 11,000 gacaca jurisdictions. Since then, non-professional judges ("inyangamugayo", or "persons of integrity") have been elected by their communities to form 19-member panels to chair the community debates and determine sentences for those found to be guilty. The inyangamugayo received training in 2002, and the gacaca pilot phase began in June 2002.

The trials are conducted in three phases. The first phase consists of collecting information regarding the events and persons involved in the genocide and identifying the claims and charges against each person. The second phase focuses on developing a legal case against accused individuals and categorizing them according to the four identified levels for crimes of genocide. The final phase consists of rendering judgement at four jurisdictional levels. The gacaca jurisdictions, which have been largely supported by the international community as well as UNDP, represent an innovative alternative to the delays of the formal justice system. They have helped bring together Rwandan society to rebuild trust, share the truth about the genocide and provide access to justice to the public.

*Sources: www.fas.harvard.edu/~socstud/rwanda/; UNDP Query: Rwanda/Consultants/Post Conflict Justice and Information Systems, Kjetil Hansen, 16 February 2004.*

In many small island countries, such as the Solomon Islands and Tuvalu, dual systems of formal and traditional law and indigenous courts have been institutionalized, and verdicts rendered by indigenous courts can be appealed in formal courts. Experience has shown that processes of reform aimed at expanding people's access to justice need to consider the best way to integrate traditional and statutory forms of justice. In Vanuatu, the National Council of Chiefs has been exploring writing a bill in which oral laws could be codified with external assistance. There have been calls to recognize the potential that chiefs' status and contributions could have for improving governance and public officials' behaviour.[217]

[217] Thuy Mellor and Jak Jabes, *Governance in the Pacific: Focus for Action 2005-2009*, ADB, 2004, p. 37.

Removing contradictions in dual systems and integrating traditional laws into formal systems can help to improve the protection of women's rights. In some countries, legislative measures have been implemented and statutory laws have aimed to reform customary laws. Many have also enacted national laws that remove gender bias. Such laws focus on women's equality in marriage, including protection from marital rape; acquisition of movable and immovable property rights; women's labour rights in terms of equal pay; maternity benefits; affirmative action; and protection from sexual harassment in the workplace. For example, Zambia has established child-friendly courts, and the United Republic of Tanzania has developed laws to punish male sexual violence against women and children. New land laws in Malawi and Mozambique address land alienation resulting from the transition from customary to leasehold tenure. In Mozambique, the recognition of group tenure rights for associations or communities fosters democracy and accountability in land administration. In addition, the country has already harmonized its land law with marriage and inheritance laws to ensure that women can take advantage of the land law.

**processes of reform aimed at expanding people's access to justice need to consider the best way to integrate traditional and statutory forms of justice**

In developing and planning legal reforms, it is important that the process be based on recognition that customary laws are not static. They evolve according to the needs of the community. Therefore, legal reforms must focus not just on the content of the customary laws, but also on the underlying premise that they are rules for sharing resources in a sustainable and equitable manner. Now that women are the majority in the agricultural sector across LDCs, reforms of customary laws must focus on protecting this group specifically. The United Republic of Tanzania's reform requires collation and analysis of all customary laws related to land. The Ugandan Action Plan includes similar features and recommends that the Law Reform Commission be strengthened to hold consultations, particularly with women, before making proposals. Overall, given the continuing weakness of the formal judicial system in many LDCs and the recent challenges of HIV/AIDS and conflict which debilitate it further, there are definite merits in turning to traditional systems to settle disputes, deliver justice and protect the people's rights.

## Access to justice

Non-discrimination and equality constitutes one of the principles of human rights and the rule of law. However, in many LDCs application of antidiscrimination laws and the protection of rights are highly discretionary. Far too frequently, the poor and the most vulnerable (notably women, minorities and individuals living with HIV/AIDS) are deprived of their rights and of access to justice.

In LDCs, as in many countries around the world, the judiciary is too distant, cumbersome, expensive and slow for the poor and the vulnerable even to attempt to access it. In 2002, there were fewer than 10 professional judges/magistrates per 100,000 inhabitants in Maldives and less than 1 per 100,000 in Ethiopia. The number of female professional judges in these countries was insignificant. The total number of persons brought before the courts in Afghanistan was less than 4 per 100,000 inhabitants. The total number of prosecution personnel in Zambia in 2001 was 0.18 per 100,000 people in 2001. In Nepal, the total number of police personnel was less than 200 per 100,000 people in 2000, and the number of female police personnel was less than 6 per 100,00 people.[218]

[218] UNODC 8th and 7th United Nations Survey on Crime Trends and the Operations of Criminal Justice Systems. Online: www.unodc.org/unodc/en/crime_cicp_survey_eighth.html#responses.

Equally troublesome is the fact that even when these vulnerable groups manage to access the judiciary, they face severe and systematic discrimination. Evidence across all regions shows that access to justice is limited in LDCs by corruption and abuse of power. In Asia, in an attempt to better cope with the complexity of corruption and related crimes, existing law enforcement structures have often been complemented by specialized anti-corruption agencies. These agencies are either given an independent status or integrated into existing law enforcement bodies, and are explicitly tasked with combating corruption. However, most LDCs in the Asia-Pacific region have not mandated anti-corruption agencies to rule on cases themselves. Therefore, the success of their work largely depends on good cooperation and communication with, and the proper functioning of, other law enforcement agencies, especially the police, public prosecutors and the courts. Reform of these institutions has received significantly less attention in recent years.[219]

Reports from the UN Human Rights Commission indicate that corruption in some LDCs' judiciary systems directly affect these institutions' ability and willingness to provide legal protection for all human rights.[220] In particular, these circumstances compromise the capacity of the judiciary to guarantee the right to fair trial and non-discriminatory application of the law.[221]

Also hampering access to justice in LDCs is the fact that courts and formal institutions for the protection of rights are absent in local communities, rural areas and remote islands. In Pacific LDCs, as well as in other LDCs in Asia and Africa, courts are located many miles away, and people who live on remote islands or outside of major urban centres find it difficult to access these institutions. Even when these institutions have branches in local communities, they often are unable to procure justice due to the lack of operational capability. Courts in most LDCs are underfunded and understaffed. Most LDCs lack sufficiently trained judges and lawyers; this in turn creates an overload of cases and long delays in the procurement of justice. Case overloads cause long delays in resolution; in many cases, suspects are detained for years while waiting for trial. As Table 4.2 indicates, more than half of the prison population in 17 LDCs is made up of pre-trial detainees.

**Access to legal information and knowledge of relevant laws are crucial components for creating an adequate set of laws and establishing the rule of law in LDCs**

Institutional weakness and failures are not the only constraint to access to justice. Building a culture of human rights entails overall rights literacy. It is particularly difficult for citizens to seek justice if they are not well informed and educated on their rights. Citizens not only need to know their rights, but also how state institutions for the provision of justice work. Trends across regions show that in most LDCs citizens lack sufficient knowledge. This is compounded by extensive bureaucratic processes and laws.

Access to legal information and knowledge of relevant laws are crucial components for creating an adequate set of laws and establishing the rule of law in LDCs. Adherence to the rule of law presupposes not just the existence of a set of rules, but also that they should be known in advance and constantly brought to the knowledge of the population. Some LDCs have ensured that the general population understands their laws by publishing them on a regular basis. This practice also creates transparency in the legislative process, allows citizens to hold judicial institutions and enforcement agencies accountable to the law, and cultivates a just environment that encourages investment and fosters

[219] See ADB OECD Anti-Corruption Initiative for Asia-Pacific. Online: www1.oecd.org/daf/ASIAcom/.

[220] Commission on Human Rights, "Civil and Political Rights, Including the Question of Independence of the Judiciary, Administration of Justice, Impunity," E/CN.4/2004/60/Add.1, 4 March 2004.

[221] Patrick Keuleers, *Governance in the Least Developed Countries in Asia and Pacific*, Bangkok, 2004, p. 19.

the confidence of the country's population as well as of the international community. However, in many LDCs that have committed to publishing laws, financial constraints have prevented journals and other media from being published on a consistent basis and thereby serving their knowledge-promotion function. For example, in Cambodia, where the constitution has mandated the publication of laws in the Official Journal, capacity constraints limit publication on a consistent basis.[222] NGOs and other civil society organizations can be particularly helpful in this area by working with governments to disseminate knowledge about laws and educate the public.

In a number of LDCs, legal aid services are rare — and they are often weak even when they exist. In Bangladesh, Mozambique, Uganda and the United Republic of Tanzania, civil society organizations have been quite active in helping address this shortfall by providing legal assistance and education on rights. In LDCs, reforms oriented to guarantee access to justice have tended to focus as a first step on improving the judiciary and the criminal-justice sector. In Uganda, for instance, the legal aid clinic Women Lawyers Association (FIDA), established in 1987, has played an important role in improving rights literacy in that country.[223]

### Strengthening judiciary

Since rights can only be guaranteed by the State, strengthening the judiciary remains an important objective in LDCs. The judiciary is the guardian of the constitution and plays a key function in building the rule of law, protecting human rights and enabling economic growth. The judiciary must be capable of guaranteeing

**Table 4.2. Pre-trial detainees in selected LDCs**

| Country | Year | Pre-trial detainees as % of the prison population |
|---|---|---|
| Angola | 2003 | 59 |
| Bangladesh | 2004 | 60 |
| Benin | 1999 | 65 |
| Burkina Faso | 2001 | 58 |
| Burundi | 2004 | 63 |
| Cambodia | 2004 | 31 |
| Cape Verde | 1999 | 37 |
| Chad | 2002 | 23 |
| Comoros | 1998 | 50 |
| Djibouti | 1999 | 57 |
| Gambia | 1999 | 19 |
| Guinea | 2002 | 51 |
| Haiti | 1999 | 84 |
| Kiribati | 2004 | 6 |
| Lao PDR | 2004 | 1 |
| Lesotho | 2005 | 16 |
| Madagascar | 1999 | 65 |
| Malawi | 2003 | 24 |
| Mali | 2002 | 67 |
| Mauritania | 2003 | 13 |
| Mozambique | 1999 | 73 |
| Myanmar | 2004 | 13 |
| Nepal | 2002 | 60 |
| Rwanda | 2002 | 2 |
| Samoa | 2003 | 7 |
| São Tomé and Principe | 2002 | 59 |
| Senegal | 2000 | 33 |
| Solomon Islands | 2005 | 35 |
| Sudan | 2003 | 10 |
| Timor-Leste | 2003 | 71 |
| Togo | 1998 | 55 |
| Uganda | 2005 | 58 |
| United Republic of Tanzania | 2004 | 49 |
| Vanuatu | 2003 | 9 |
| Zambia | 2003 | 39 |

*Source: www.kcl.ac.uk/depsta/rel/icps/worldbrief/highest_to_lowest_rates.html.*

[222] World Bank, "Cambodia — Legal and Judicial Reform Project, East Asia and Pacific Region," Project ID #: KHPE71289.

[223] See www.wougnet.org/Profiles/fidau.html

equitable, expeditious and transparent dispute resolution to citizens, economic agents and the State. Some LDCs, such as Yemen, have made good progress in modernizing their judiciary and providing better services to their people (see Box 4.3).

## Box 4.3. Yemen: Modernization of the judiciary

Yemen has made significant improvements in modernizing its justice sector through the UNDP-supported Modernization of Justice Sector (MOJS) project. This project's main goals are to strengthen the autonomy of the judiciary, provide citizens with greater access to justice and ensure the fair and efficient administration of justice. Furthermore, these reform measures aim to accelerate economic growth and create a hospitable environment for investment. In Yemen, the key achievements of the MOJS programme have been the establishment of a case management application (CMA) system in two pilot courts; a telephone hotline and legal help desk for free legal assistance; an electronic judicial information system and Web site; and an Internet Legal Research Unit.

MOJS implemented the CMA in the court of West Sanaa. All cases under review in this court are being entered into the CMA and are categorized in a way that enables statistics, information and reports to be extracted for managerial purposes. This is intended to improve monitoring, combat corruption, provide an early warning system and streamline court procedures.

The telephone hotline and help desk are staffed by a trained professional lawyer who offers legal information and assistance about cases to the public for free. This official also offers in-house legal advice to women and other vulnerable groups such as illiterate citizens and children. The help desk also provides information to litigants regarding their rights as defendants and court fees.

The MOJS-supported electronic legal database (ELD) contains all of Yemen's laws and judicial decisions decided by the Supreme Court; the public and judges can access them through the Ministry of Justice's website (www.moj.gov.ye). With the assistance of the ELD, judges can more easily follow and comply with Supreme Court decisions, which will enhance transparency.

The Internet Legal Research Unit, which is housed in the Ministry of Justice's headquarters in Sanaa, offers 24-hour Internet access to judges and staff. The unit enables judges to learn from and conduct legal research on legal experiences in other parts of the world that can benefit the Yemeni judiciary. MOJS also developed an English-language website so that foreign investors can easily access information about Yemen's Ministry of Justice to enhance foreign investment.

*Sources: UNDP Press Release, "UNDP Launches Hotline for Free Legal Assistance and Supports Automated Legal Information and Case Management System," 19 March 2005; www.yemen.gov.ye/egov/justice-english/index.html.*

In most democratic societies, the judiciary shares equal responsibility for ensuring good governance with the executive and legislative branches. A well-functioning judiciary carefully considers the credibility of legal frameworks and works to ensure that the other powers of State are fully accountable, under the law, for their activities and decisions. The judiciary thus plays a key role in combating corruption. The unique importance of judicial institutions is recognized in the United Convention against Corruption, which devotes a specific provision (Article 11) to judicial issues. In many countries, though, the judiciary is the weak link in the governance structure. Where corruption is widespread, scepticism characterizes most people's view of internal anti-corruption units within a chief prosecutor's office, for example. (In Mozambique, the prosecutor's capacity to undertake preventive measures and coordinate with civil society and youth organizations has been severely compromised by real and perceived corruption.) If the judicial

## Box 4.4. Sierra Leone: Campaign for good governance

In 2002, Sierra Leonean citizens created the National Accountability Group (NAG) to serve as an autonomous civil society organization to combat the widespread corruption that resulted from decades of civil war. NAG is currently affiliated with Transparency International, an international NGO fighting corruption that is also the local contact organization for Sierra Leone's Campaign for Good Governance. NAG's mission is to "closely watch the conduct of public functionaries and to strive towards the elimination of corruption, fiscal impropriety and injustice in Sierra Leone."

NAG has already begun to cultivate a relationship with the government's Anti-Corruption Commission, and is seeking to create partnerships with other government bodies that address issues of corruption. It also strives to collaborate with other civil society organizations to build an anti-corruption coalition.

NAG works with these government bodies and civil society organizations to raise awareness about corruption among the Sierra Leonean public through education, theatre, newsletters and press releases. Transparency International provides NAG with posters, manuals and other documents to be distributed as part of a public campaign against corruption. This campaign includes a national anti-corruption week during which NAG collaborates with drama groups to coordinate skits and plays concerning anti-corruption that can be aired on radio stations and television. Educational institutions are encouraged to teach students about corruption and transparency. NAG facilitates broad-based discussions on corruption that are aired on the radio, and take place in person in Freetown, the capital, and in other parts of the country. NAG also strives to organize a public forum where presidential candidates can debate on corruption-related issues. Lastly, NAG has formed a partnership with the Anti-Corruption Commission to regularly disseminate material on anti-corruption to legislators; these materials are designed to address the detrimental effects of corruption and encourage lawmakers to initiate legislative campaigns to curb and expose corruption.

*Source: www.slcgg.org/nagconcept.htm.*

system is weak and unpredictable, then efforts to provide remedies through the courts will be problematic. It is at the judicial level that corruption does the greatest harm and where reforms have the greatest potential to improve the situation. The Sierra Leone experience is a good one in this regard (see Box 4.4).

Judicial independence is a crucial part of a properly functioning judiciary. The judiciary must be perceived by the public as an impartial, accessible body that strives to protect their rights. The separation of powers in the government is essential for judicial independence. Although many constitutions in LDCs lay the groundwork for an autonomous judiciary and separation of powers among government branches, the judiciary often lacks the respect accorded the other branches. It is frequently pressured by powerful executives or parliaments, which can lead to it being relegated to the position of an advisor to the executive, for example, and to the loss of decision-making independence. Where adequate separation of powers does not exist, politicians are able to change the rule of law whenever convenient, thus jeopardizing the right of the people and economic operators to participate and undertake economic, social and political activities in a predictable manner.

In many LDCs, rights and freedoms are generally given great priority in the Constitution, and provisions are elaborated for the independence of the judiciary. For instance, Article 5 of the Constitution of Yemen declares the country's commitment to

the rights codified in leading international human rights instruments, and Article 147 provides for the independence of the judiciary as an institution and for the independence of individual judges themselves. However, many of these safeguards in LDCs are compromised by the historic domination of the executive over the judiciary. The Head of State usually has the ability to preside over constitutional bodies, and the judgements are delivered and enforced in his or her name. This imbalance of power renders the judiciary ineffective, undermining its ability to protect human rights and support democratic rule of law. Furthermore, some constitutions contain provisions that conflict with international human rights law because they allow recourse to ideological or religious principles; notably, those in many Arab LDCs include Shari'ah (Islamic law) as a source of legislation. Such a provision may result in personal discretion in interpreting Shari'ah texts instead of requiring that judgement be based on pre-established legal principles.[224]

Judicial accountability must accompany judicial independence. To establish public confidence in the court system, judges must be accountable to deciding cases fairly and impartially. They should not be influenced by external forces such as the media, public opinion, colleagues or even their own personal desires. Their commitment to resisting these influences prevents corruption and ensures transparency and efficiency in the judicial process.

Judicial accountability is enhanced when judges have security of office and are therefore insulated from political whims and retaliation. This provides a legal guarantee that they cannot be removed from their posts during their terms for any reason other than incapacity or misbehaviour. These two loopholes must be interpreted strictly to refer to physical or mental constraints or crimes, offences or gross acts of negligence that make judges unfit to serve.[225] Furthermore, judges must be guaranteed an adequate salary to ensure that they will decide cases impartially and without any bias toward personal benefit.[226] Adequate judicial salaries can improve the quality of justice because they allow judges to meet their personal and family needs.

Moreover, judges must be professionally competent to fill this role. Many LDCs have struggled with inadequately trained judiciaries, and have instituted training programmes to remedy this problem. Some have also used expatriate and mobile judges (see Box 4.5). Judicial competence is also increased by appropriate appointment procedures for judges that encourage the legitimacy of the judiciary and strengthen its role. "If the selection and appointment process is more transparent, open and participatory, the judiciary can employ more competent, independent and impartial judges".[227]

**some Pacific LDCs have institutionalized the use of mobile judges so that remote islands can be served adequately without having a permanent judge**

Sufficient financial resources ensure the autonomy of the judiciary and enable the proper performance of judicial tasks. In many LDCs, inadequate judiciary budgets have created problems of understaffing, which in turn create a backlog of cases that cannot be addressed in a timely and efficient manner. This can be a major problem because it negatively affects the public's confidence in the institution and increases opportunities for judges to engage in corrupt practices. Some LDCs have introduced innovative mechanisms in order to overcome these financial limitations. For example, some Pacific LDCs have institutionalized the use of mobile judges so that remote islands can be served ade-

[224] UNDP, *Arab Human Development Report 2004: Towards Freedom in the Arab World*, New York, 2005.

[225] Luu Tien Dung, "Judicial Independence in Transitional Countries," Oslo Governance Centre, UNDP, 2003, p. 20.

[226] Ibid., p. 21.

[227] Ibid., pp. 27-28.

## Box 4.5. Expatriate and mobile judges in LDCs

Many countries in Africa, Asia and the Pacific have used expatriate judges at different periods in their history. This practice was common during colonial times, when almost all the members of the judiciary were citizens of colonizing powers. After independence the general trend was to replace expatriate judges with national ones. However, in recent years special circumstances, most related to capacity or legitimacy deficits, have caused many countries to return to the practice of using expatriate judges in the national judicial system.

Many Pacific LDCs, including Vanuatu, Kiribati and the Solomon Islands, use expatriate judges and legal professionals. Doing so has allowed these countries to expand access to justice to citizens despite human and institutional constraints. In the Solomon Islands, for instance, some magistrates and some judges in the Apex Court are expatriates — as is the Solicitor General.

In some LDCs, foreign judges have been used for trials where judiciaries are highly politicized and perceived as biased or corrupt. In other cases, expatriate judges are seated on courts dealing with serious humanitarian crimes to help ensure an impartial and fair trial process. The United Nations has played an important role in supporting these types of trials. For example, the Government of Sierra Leone and the United Nations agreed to establish a "special court for Sierra Leone to prosecute persons who bear the greatest responsibility for serious violations of international humanitarian law and Sierra Leonean law committed in the territory of Sierra Leone since 30 November 1996." Judges on this special court are appointed by the Government of Sierra Leone and the Secretary-General based on nominations forwarded by States — in particular the member States of the Economic Community of West African States and the Commonwealth — at the invitation of the Secretary-General.

*Source: UNDP Bangkok SURF, "Substantive Research Piece — East Timor: Global Experiences Using Expatriate Judges," August 2002. Online: www.sierra-leone.org/specialcourtagreement.html www.gfbv.de/gfbv_e/uno/geneva00/kambod_2.htm.*

quately without having a permanent judge (see Box 4.5).

The budget preparation for the judiciary is important for many LDCs. The judiciary's budget must be decided on by the proper authority, with the input of the judiciary. The process of creating this budget provides an opportunity for communication among the various branches of the government. Specifically, it enables the parliament to employ its oversight functions and gain credibility as a democratic institution. The core of any parliament's work lies in its mandate to enforce financial and economic policy accountability. For many LDCs, however, parliaments are essentially excluded from fulfilling their oversight role because of direct donor negotiations for funding and support at ministry levels or because borrowed funds are negotiated directly between the executive and the funding agency.

Many LDCs in post-conflict situations have adopted various mechanisms of transitional justice to restore peace, justice and democracy to their countries (see Box 4.6). Transitional justice refers to the full range of processes and mechanisms associated with a society's attempts to come to terms with a legacy of large-scale past abuses. Among the important objectives of transitional justice are to ensure accountability and lay the groundwork for reconciliation. In searching for suitable transitional justice mechanisms, many post-conflict LDCs have relied on truth commissions, which are official, temporary, non-judicial fact-finding bodies that investigate a pattern of abuse of human rights or humanitarian law committed over a number of years. These bodies usually take a vic-

tim-centred approach and conclude their work with a final report of findings of fact and recommendations. Truth commissions, which are generally established in consultation with the local population, create a historical record of the conflict (or conflicts, depending on the commission's mandate) to reveal the truth about state and non-state abuses. Their sensitivity to local culture, traditions and customs help to restore public trust in national governance institutions. Nonetheless, truth commissions present potential risks of impunity as well, especially when advancing accountability for past human rights abuses and when prosecutorial efforts are not pursued. Past experiences with truth commissions have shown that truth seeking needs to be accompanied with prosecutorial efforts, strengthening of local court systems and measures to prevent future abuses.

Transitional justice mechanisms are quite varied in their approaches and policy options, and there is no single path. In the end, different country contexts, institutional frameworks and resources define which mechanism is appropriate in a society's search for justice. The challenges remain similar, though, regardless of the mechanism: to define concepts and objectives clearly; address financial questions; respond fairly and compassionately to victims, and acknowledge the full range of violations; overcome disparities in isolated judicial remedies; and reinforce victims' dignity by relating reparations to truth-seeking, accountability and reform.

### Reforming criminal-justice systems

Many LDCs have embarked on the process of reforming the criminal-justice apparatus, mainly the police. Improving police institutions is essential to improve citizens' quality of life because police are responsible for enforcing laws and regulations. In many cases citizens are so distanced from the courts and lawyers that police are the only justice institution that they encounter in their daily lives. The nature of police work also puts police officers in regular contact with people on the streets. How well they respond to the needs of — and respect the rights of — those they serve has a great impact on public perception and evaluation of the overall performance of the government. A key thing to acknowledge is that police abuses and corruption have a direct, negative impact on citizens' lives and livelihoods. This is particularly true for the poor and more vulnerable groups, who are disproportionately affected by crime as well as abuses of power by public safety institutions — which in turn increases their feelings of insecurity and vulnerability.[228]

**In many LDCs, police forces are not able to respond adequately to citizens' demands for increased security because of serious institutional, social and financial constraints**

In many LDCs, police forces are not able to respond adequately to citizens' demands for increased security because of serious institutional, social and financial constraints. Police forces often have a shortage of supervisory and managerial experience; are under-resourced and under-trained; lack specialized technical capacity to deal with emerging crimes; and place insufficient priority on overall strategic planning, including human resource and career development, transparency and accountability of functions and sustainability of operations. Moreover, police forces are often distrusted by the community because of their involvement in corruption and other abuses of power. Vulnerable groups such as the poor, minorities, women and young people are disproportionately mistreated and abused by the police.

It is worth emphasizing police forces' inability or unwillingness to acknowledge or

[228] See UK Department for International Development (DFID), "Safety, Security and Accessible Justice: Putting Policy into Practice," July 2002, p. 14.

## Box 4.6. Experiences with transitional justice: Truth commissions in Sierra Leone and Timor-Leste

In Sierra Leone, the peace agreement in 1999 between warring parties called for the establishment of a truth and reconciliation commission. UNDP helped to develop this commission by facilitating a consultation process with stakeholders, international experts, district coordinators and others to review reconciliation methodologies and to develop a unique, country-specific reconciliation system for Sierra Leone. The commission, enacted in 2000, was mandated to produce a report on the violations of human rights dating from the beginning of the conflict in 1991, and to issue recommendations to encourage reconciliation and ensure the prevention of future abuses. The commission provided a forum for perpetrators and victims by holding hearings throughout the country. It also received statements from more than 7,000 victims and set the framework for the peace process.

In the case of Sierra Leone, the search for justice for former human rights abuses did not stop with the creation of the truth commission. In 2002, a parallel Special Court for Sierra Leone was created to try serious violations of humanitarian law. Both the commission and the Special Court agreed to work independently and not to share information on the cases and investigation, with the objective of guaranteeing confidentiality of the information received. The simultaneous operation of both bodies has revealed their complementarities, but also some of the difficulties and confusions that can arise.

In July of 2001, the UN Transitional Administration in Timor-Leste established the Commission for Reception, Truth and Reconciliation (CAVR), which integrated formal law and local and traditional conflict-resolution mechanisms to fulfil its mandate of "truth seeking" by investigating human rights violations committed between April 1974 and October 1999. The commission sought to obtain "community reconciliation" by facilitating the reintegration of minor criminal offenders who voluntarily submitted confessions to a panel of local community leaders and a regional commissioner. Members of this panel functioned as mediators between perpetrators and victims "to reach agreement on an act of reconciliation to be carried out by the perpetrator." CAVR also made recommendations and reported its findings to the government, which continues to seek reconciliation and the promotion of human rights.

Focus group discussions were an important step in the creation of this commission. Conducted by the International Centre for Transitional Justice, these discussions were aimed at obtaining Timorese people's opinions about and perspectives on how to deal with past human right violations. The commission has facilitated hundreds of hearings and investigations and taken statements from thousands of individuals throughout the country. The commission submitted its final report to the President on 31 October 2005, marking the end of more than three years of intensive work and the dissolution of the CAVR. The commission's legal mandate to research and report the facts, contribute to victims' dignity and recommend measures to prevent future abuses cannot be discharged without publicizing the final report. The CAVR final report is a comprehensive and detailed record of human rights violation during the Indonesian occupation, based on rigorous analysis and extensive information collected from a wide range of sources, including thousands of witnesses and victims. The CAVR final report also recommended measures to ensure that justice is done and reparations are made to Timorese victims and their families.

Other post-conflict LDCs have also decided to adopt truth commissions as their preferred transitional justice mechanism. Liberia's Comprehensive Peace Agreement established Liberia's Truth and Reconciliation Commission, which is currently working to define its mandate. The Democratic Republic of the Congo is striving to implement a Truth and Reconciliation Commission as one of the institutions of the Transitional Constitution, although the political sensitivity of the conflict and limited capacity have stalled its implementation.

*Sources: www.easttimor-reconciliation.org/mandate.htm#Purpose;" The Report of the Secretary-General on The Rule of Law and Transitional Justice in Conflict and Post-Conflict Societies," Network consolidated replies on Transitional Justice, 20 May 2005, online; www.usip.org/library/truth.html; Thierry Cruvellier, " The Special Court for Sierra Leone: The First Eighteen Months," Case Study Series, International Centre for Transitional Justice (ICTJ), March 2004; Megan Hirst and Howard Varney, "Justice Abandoned? An Assessment of the Serious Crimes Process in East Timor," Occasional Paper Series, ICTJ, June 2005.*

respond to their insensitivity toward women. For one thing, women in LDCs experience human rights abuses in the form of domestic abuse or other gender-based violence; often, such abuse is both condoned and perpetrated by police officers, either intentionally or as a result of their ignorance about how to confront situations of gender-based violence without further victimizing the survivor. Secondly, police officers themselves are the aggressors in some situations. The mistreatment by police of female detainees and women in the commercial sex trade is well-known in many areas. In response, some LDCs are undertaking police reform measures that highlight gender sensitivity (see Box 4.7).

Police reform efforts in LDCs generally have focused on two measures: to improve state responsiveness in the provision of public safety and to improve mechanisms of accountability and control of the police. The long-term goals of the first measure are to improve the quality of services provided and to increase efficiency; the second, meanwhile, aims to improve respect for and protection of rights.

**efforts targeted at police reform should be considered in the context of reform of the entire rule of law sector and state apparatus, which includes the judiciary as well as prisons**

Since the police force plays a key role in enforcing law and order within a society, efforts targeted at police reform should be considered in the context of reform of the entire rule of law sector and state apparatus, which includes the judiciary as well as prisons. Police reform is greatly strengthened by the existence of an independent, accountable and efficient judiciary. An effective judiciary is able to transparently and fairly address instances of police misconduct and abuse, thereby reinforcing the legitimacy and accountability of the police force.

Institutional strengthening of the police force also is an important element of the larger goal of creating a criminal-justice system that is accountable and respects and promotes human rights. Most police officers understand that torture, accepting bribes and becoming involved in trafficking are illegal activities, but they have few if any incentives to refrain from engaging in this conduct. Therefore, incentive structures that encourage police officers to perform their job according to the rule of law, and discourage them from violating these principles by punishing them, are essential for effective police reform and embedding adherence to human rights into the culture of the law enforcement institution. Institutional safeguards that prevent misconduct and impunity are therefore essential. Independent oversight bodies that have the power to investigate and punish abuses and are transparent, objective and effective can limit police misconduct.

At the same time, accountability mechanisms such as public complaints procedures and internal disciplinary measures can help ensure that the police comply with human rights standards and are properly disciplined for misconduct. Accountability mechanisms encourage professionalism, integrity and discipline — and embed these concepts within the institutional culture. "An effective police oversight mechanism helps reinforce the twin goals of respectful and effective policing; disciplined and proper police behaviour means fewer rights violations and more public cooperation which in turn leads to lower crime."[229]

Other tools that encourage institutional strengthening of the police force include "diagnostics of institutional weaknesses, data-gathering and analysis, merit-based performance evaluations, measures to assess impact of programmes, leadership development and budgetary oversight,"[230] and meticulous police record-keeping. These institutional safeguards promote police accountability and adherence to human rights norms, and

[229] William O'Neill, "Police Reform and Human Rights: A HURIST Document," UNDP, 2004, p. 14.

[230] Ibid., p. 5.

## Box 4.7. Policing and gender concerns: some positive measures

Many LDCs have implemented gender-sensitive police reforms that strive to promote greater inclusion of women within police forces and provide greater protection and respect for their rights. Women are significantly underrepresented in the police forces of many LDCs. For example, in Bangladesh, women comprise only 1.2 percent of the police force. However, LDCs such as Bangladesh and Sierra Leone have implemented police reform projects to combat these abuses, and they now pay specific attention to the gender dimensions of police protection. These countries have worked to build the capacity of police officers so they have the skills to accurately respond to gender-sensitive situations, such as interviewing a victim of sexual abuse or arresting a suspect without perpetrating sexual abuse. These reforms have improved the legitimacy of the police forces in these countries, encouraged a more participatory citizenry within the security sector, and enhanced the respect for human rights and rules of law on behalf of police officers.

In Sierra Leone, senior female police officers worked with an officer from the UN Mission in Sierra Leone to develop a system to confront reporting challenges faced by victims of gender-based violence. These officers established a domestic violence police unit and created trainings and protocols designed to help officers properly respond to victims of domestic violence and rape. They also are working to develop a safe house for victims and to establish a collaborative relationship among the police, counselling programmes and health services to help improve the treatment of survivors of gender-based violence.

In Bangladesh, UNDP and the UK Department for International Development launched the Strengthening Bangladesh Police programme in January 2003. Among other goals, this three-year project seeks to help women gain access to police services and be recruited into the police force through a nationwide recruiting campaign. Bangladesh currently has the second highest rate of domestic violence in the world, according to a UN report, and this police reform programme is expected to enable the police force to better understand victim trauma, provide adequate support mechanisms, and overcome the reluctance of many women to seek help from the police.

*Sources: "If Not Now, When? Addressing Gender-based Violence in Refugee, Internally Displaced, and Post-conflict settings," Women's Commission for Refugee Women and Children; UNDP News Release, "Government launches 'pro-people' police reform project, UNDP and DFID to provide funds and technical support," British High Commission, Dhaka, Bangladesh, 11 January 2003; William O'Neill, "Police Reform and Human Rights: A HURIST Document," UNDP, 2004*

prevent corruption and incidences of covering up police abuse.

In Sierra Leone, institutional strengthening played a large role in police reform efforts. Strict financial controls and increased budget oversight have created disincentives for police officers to engage in corrupt activities; consequently, the public image and integrity of the police force have improved. Officials in Haiti, with the help of the joint UN/OAS International Civilian Mission and the United States Government, reformed the police force in September of 1994 to create the Haitian National Police (HNP). As part of the reform process, the HNP institutionalized public announcement of criminal statistics and trends. This included revealing the number of complaints filed against the police and disclosing the names of people being investigated as well as the status of these investigations. These steps served as a warning that impunity would not be tolerated within the new policy force, and that officers risked losing their jobs or being prosecuted if they failed to follow the rules. The reforms, therefore, created necessary incentives for police officers to respect human rights and prevent corruption. Unfortunately, these

highly effective HNP reforms disintegrated following the political stalemate in Haiti beginning in 2000.[231]

Police reform efforts must also solicit the support of the police officers themselves to ensure their compliance with reform measures. Police reform is a long-term process that requires transforming power relations in societies. A police force that adequately and consistently protects the public and safeguards human rights is one that has rejected a model of policing based on repression and social control. Therefore, police officers not only must be trained in the protection of human rights, but they also must be active and meaningful participants in all aspects of the reform process. The input and suggestions of police officers should be solicited and incorporated in reform strategies; merely providing training on human rights issues is not sufficient to ensure that they will respect and adhere to these principles when executing their duties. Police should also be reminded that crime and disorder are likely to decline as a result of police reforms that emphasize respect for human rights.

**Police reforms must engage civil society and work to change the negative relationship that often exists between the police and the public**

Police reforms must engage civil society and work to change the negative relationship that often exists between the police and the public into a positive one in which the public perceives the role of the police as protecting them and ensuring their human rights. To implement this change, which often has the important added-on effect of increasing the public's willingness to assist police in preventing and solving crimes, the police also must cultivate a relationship with civil society and provide it with information about its role and create spaces for dialogue. Police services should conduct public information campaigns describing the reforms and the concrete ways in which people can and should collaborate and cooperate with the police so that crime is reduced while rights are protected. Such campaigns should be followed by regular updates on the progress of the reforms, crime statistics, and the number and nature of complaints about police misconduct made by the public.

In Timor-Leste, community participation was a significant factor in the UN's efforts in developing the Timor Lorosae Police Services (TLPS). Prior to the establishment of the TLPS, the police were distrusted by the local population because they were part of the Indonesian forces occupying Timor-Leste. To involve the community from the very beginning, the UN established a TLPS Institution Strengthening Committee; local NGOs are represented on this committee, and they participate in the review and revising of standard operating procedures in the police force so that the community can understand and have influence over setting standards for police behaviour. Also, in recognition of the fact that more than 50 percent of the Timorese population is below the age of 21, the police received training — with the assistance of UNICEF — in how to handle the problems of young people and respect their human rights. For instance, police officers were taught how to interview victims of child abuse in a way that allows investigators to obtain the necessary information about the perpetrator but not re-traumatize the child.

In Sierra Leone, the Local Needs Policing programme was initiated in 2000, in partnership with UK police reformers, to involve the community in police reforms. Through this programme, community members were consulted about policing and asked to identify problems. In response to community concerns about domestic violence, specialized training was provided to the police to help them respond adequately and appropriately.

[231] Ibid., p. 43.

Both police and criminal-justice systems generally need to undergo massive reforms in post-conflict settings. In many cases, existing police forces lack legitimacy either because they participated in human rights abuses or they lack society-wide representation because their members primarily belong to one of the groups involved in conflict. Additionally, post-conflict situations require the creation of institutions that allow for the development of peace, public order and implementation of rule of law. The paradox of post-conflict police reforms is that these settings offer both unparalleled opportunities to rethink and to redesign police institutions, as well as deeply hostile environments for the implementation of ambitious reform plans.[232]

**The paradox of post-conflict police reforms is that these settings offer both unparalleled opportunities to rethink and to redesign police institutions, as well as deeply hostile environments for the implementation of ambitious reform plans**

## Monitoring the rule of law and human rights

The preceding discussion clearly indicates that safeguarding human rights and implementing the rule of law in LDCs are complicated processes with several important elements, including reforms in national human rights institutions; constitutional reforms; and reforms in the legal structure, including the judiciary system and the criminal legal framework. Also appropriate in many cases, in addition to reforms of these existing structures, are the creation of new institutions and the consideration of innovative approaches based on local culture and traditions. But implementation is not the last word in the process. There also must be proper and objective monitoring and evaluation of the processes and outcomes.

Monitoring and evaluation of justice system reforms serves many purposes. First, they allow countries to assess the progressive realization of vulnerable people's human rights. Second, they help to improve reform efforts by generating the information necessary to improve and make the policy-making process more efficient. Without proper monitoring it is impossible to measure the tangible results of programmes designed to guide reform of the justice system. Third, monitoring and evaluation can incorporate different societal groups and state institutions, thus increasing participation, inclusion and transparency. Examining the implementation of the rules of law is essential for creating state institutions that are transparent and accountable.

### Monitoring of the rule of law and human rights — international level

At the international level, implementation of human rights treaties is monitored by Special Rapporteurs[233] and committees (also know as treaty-monitoring bodies). In the United Nations system there are seven committees that provide monitoring: the Human Rights Committee, which monitors the implementation of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights; the Committee against Torture; the Committee on the

[232] Mariza Ziegler and Rachel Neild, "From Peace to Governance: Police Reform and the International Community," WOLA, 2002, p. 3.

[233] Special Rapporteurs are individuals who serve as representative, independent experts appointed by the Chairperson of the Commission on Human Rights after consultation with the five regional groups, which consist of Member States of the Commission. Special Rapporteurs are independent, do not get paid for their services, and serve in a personal capacity for a maximum of six years. Mandates of Rapporteurs vary, but they usually examine, monitor, advise and publicly report on human rights situations in specific countries or on major phenomena of human rights violations worldwide, known as thematic mandates. Various activities can be undertaken by special procedures, including conducting studies, providing advice on technical cooperation, responding to individual complaints, and engaging in general promotional activities. See www.unhchr.ch/html/menu2/2/mechanisms.htm.

Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination; the Committee on the Rights of the Child; the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women; the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights; and the Committee on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families. The legal basis for the establishment of most treaty-monitoring bodies can be found in the treaties themselves. They are composed of independent experts of recognized competence in the field of human rights who are elected by UN Member States.

The information presented in the reports produced by these committees comes from periodic government reports[234] and non-governmental sources (civil society organizations, academic institutions and the media). After reviewing all the information available, the committee members examine the report together with government representatives. Based on this dialogue, a committee publishes its concerns and recommendations, referred to as concluding observations.[235]

International monitoring mechanisms rely on national monitoring and accountability processes (both from the State and civil society) and the existence of reliable data. Essential for the monitoring of the rules of law is the watchdog and oversight functions that civil society and parliamentary bodies perform with regard to human rights and the justice system. This oversight can come from NGOs working in monitoring and advocacy, the media and parliamentary committees. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, there are important examples of civil society monitoring the rule of law in countries such as Benin and Togo.[236]

### Monitoring the rule of law and human rights — national level

Monitoring of the rule of law and human rights is often perceived by those within LDCs as not a major government priority; instead, they view it as an example of international pressure. Such beliefs are short-sighted. National level monitoring is vital to improve the provision of justice for all members of society. Monitoring and evaluation at the national level should consist of five fundamental things:

- benchmark indicators;
- systematic surveys;
- impact analysis;
- dissemination of results; and
- identification of responsibilities.

**In many LDCs, national monitoring is complicated by lack of available and reliable data and limited expertise on human rights and the justice system.**

In many LDCs, national monitoring is complicated by lack of available and reliable data and limited expertise on human rights and the justice system. LDCs need to pay particular attention to the generation of indicators and data to measure the progress in

[234] Once a country has ratified one of international treaties, it assumes the obligation to implement the rights and to submit regular reports to the monitoring committee set up under that treaty on how the rights are being implemented. This system of human rights monitoring is common to most of the UN human rights treaties. See Office of the High Commissioner of Human Rights, Introduction to the Treaty Monitoring Bodies, www.unhchr.ch/html/menu2/6/intro.htm.

[235] See Office of the High Commissioner of Human Rights, Monitoring the Core International Human Rights Treaties, online: www.ohchr.org/english/bodies/treaty/.

[236] See Dieter Weiss, "The Law, Legal Certainty and Empowerment, the Concept of Law within a Cultural Context," Institute of International Economics, Berlin Free University, Germany, 2002. Online: www.inwent.org/ef-texte/law/rep.htm#t52.

people's enjoyment of their rights and access to justice, as well as governments' commitment and fulfilment of their human rights obligations.

Governance statistical services, which collect and disseminate data related to justice and criminal-justice sectors (number of judges, police, prisons, prisoners, etc.), are essential for monitoring activities.[237] Disaggregated data by gender, age, regions and important ethnic and minority groups is the best way to determine how the rights of different sectors of society are respected.[238] As such, it is necessary to elaborate relevant indicators and to combine quantitative and qualitative data to understand how vulnerable groups experience discrimination, exclusion and inequality in the development process and in the fulfilment of their rights.

**Disaggregated data by gender, age, regions and important ethnic and minority groups is the best way to determine how the rights of different sectors of society are respected**

Benchmark surveys and indicators should be understood, developed and interpreted with regard to local conditions. Data and indicators are tools for making policy better; they are not an objective in themselves.[239] The accessibility, cost and reliability of data are central criteria in selecting an indicator. Often, finding reliable and accessible data on problems related to access to justice is difficult, and other cost-effective methods to find data should be considered (e.g., participatory process).[240]

National human rights institutions (NHRIs) play important roles in the monitoring and evaluation of the human rights in LDCs. Because of their intermediary position between the State and society, they have access to different types of information and data (generated by both government and non-governmental sources) and can monitor human rights from different angles. However, NHRIs cannot realistically offer an alternative to government statistical services. Instead, they must work with the information available from official statistics or other reputable sources. At a very basic level NHRIs can help simply by identifying the types of information that they believe should be gathered to allow a critical evaluation of the effectiveness of government policies in relation to human rights. They can also identify indicators of positive steps taken by government in this area (e.g., training of judicial and police officers in applying human rights standards).[241]

Objective evaluation of impacts for policies and reforms can guide all concerned in the right direction. Transparency and accountability require that results of evaluations and impact analyses should be broadly disseminated, debated and discussed to identify obstacles, learn lessons and create conditions for future reform. At the same time, it is critical to identify which duty holders have satisfied their obligations and which have not — and to suggest proper measures to rectify the situation.

---

[237] United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNDOC) periodically produces International Crime Victim Surveys (ICVS), which include data on justice and criminal-justice systems (e.g., number of judges and number of people prosecuted). However, only three LDCs are considered in these surveys. Online: www.unodc.org/unodc/en/research_icvs.html.

[238] See Isabel Kempf, "Expert Workshop on Data Collection and Disaggregation on Indigenous Peoples," Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, 19-21 January 2004.

[239] International Council on Human Rights Policy, "National Human Rights Institutions: Impact Assessment Indicators," 2005, p. 59. [Draft Report for Consultation].

[240] UNDP suggests the use of participation to complement analysis of secondary data. Using adequate techniques in a participation process consultation with people from vulnerable and disadvantage groups, it is possible to obtain relevant data on their problems in accessing justice. See UNDP, "Programming for Justice: Access for All; A Practitioner's Guide to a Human Rights-Based Approach to Access to Justice," Bangkok, UNDP Asia-Pacific Rights and Justice Initiative, 2005.

[241] International Council on Human Rights Policy, "National Human Rights Institutions: Impact Assessment Indicators," 2005, pp. 49-50. [Draft Report for Consultation].

CHAPTER FIVE

# Global governance and LDCs

# Introduction

**global governance structures are often not favourable to LDCs' needs**

Other chapters of this Report have addressed the importance of democratic governance for meeting the MDGs and creating sustainable development. Democratic governance at the national level does not occur in isolation, however; it is influenced by the different actors, institutions and decision-making processes taking place at the international level. These global governance[242] structures are often not favourable to LDCs' needs. Frequently, LDCs are integrated into global economic and political governance systems from weak positions. On the economic side, LDCs are often unable to penetrate developed-country markets even while their own markets are easily and consistently penetrated. Their economic weakness and vulnerability are exacerbated as a result. LDCs also are excluded from having an effective voice in global political and economic institutions, thereby reinforcing their marginality, limiting their capacity to pursue some development policies, and reducing their already insufficient influence during negotiations.

The basic objective of this chapter is to discuss the role of global governance in addressing LDCs' development challenges. It starts with a description of development challenges that LDCs are facing at the global level, detailing both the progress made and the remaining challenges. The following section presents some of the structural constraints that LDCs face in the global system. Based on the BPoA and other international instruments, the third section examines some of the principles of global governance that can foster a better participation and inclusion of LDCs in global institutions and decision-making processes. The final section concentrates on what needs to be done, in terms of strategies and reforms, in the realm of global governance so that LDCs can get effective support for their efforts to overcome development challenges.

# Global development challenges for LDCs — forms and nature

The development challenges faced by LDCs at the global level range from access to global market opportunities to financial flows, from migration and brain drain to WTO's Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS), from conflicts to global environmental concerns. These challenges, some of which also have regional and sub-regional dimensions, are created by global disparities in income and wealth distribution among countries; asymmetrical access to opportunities; absence of level playing fields; and inadequate representation in the global arena. All these issues have significant implications for LDCs as they face their development challenges.

[242] In this context, global governance refers to the "institutions, organizations, networks and processes generated by global actors to guide and restrain the behaviour of themselves and others in both national and international domains. These global actors include governments and multilateral or inter-state organizations, private-sector actors that organize and undertake their commercial activities on a global basis, and NGOs whose membership, values, issues, organization or actions have a transnational or supraterritorial element. Global governance is a broader term than 'global government,' which suggests a centralized authority capable of creating formal obligations without the explicit consent of affected states and other parties." Ngaire Woods, "Accountability in Global Governance," UNDP Human Development Report 2002, Occasional Paper, p. 5. Online: http://hdr.undp.org/docs/publications/background_papers/2002/Woods_2002.pdf. .

## Global disparities

Global disparities in income, wealth and human development outcomes are stark. In 2004, the GDP per capita (calculated by PPP) of LDCs was $1,270, compared with $4,306 for developing countries and $29,624 for members of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD).[243] LDCs account for only 0.6 percent of global GDP and the same proportion of global trade[244]. In terms of human development outcomes, people in LDCs in 2003 had a life expectancy of 51 years — twelve fewer years than the average in developing countries.[245] LDCs' adult literacy rate, 53 percent, was significantly lower than that in the developing world as a whole.[246] Only 61 percent of the people in LDCs have access to safe water, compared with almost 79 percent in developing countries.[247]

Global disparities exist not only among countries, but among individuals as well. The world's richest 500 people have a combined income greater than that of the poorest 416 million. About 40 percent of the world's population accounts for only 5 percent of the global income; people in this category live on less than $2 a day. On the other hand, the richest 10 percent, almost all of whom live in high-income countries, account for 54 percent of global income.[248]

## Trade barriers and distortions

LDCs face great challenges as they attempt to participate in world trade. Many obstacles stem from their inability to diversify their exports, reduce the cost of doing business and improve transportation, communication and energy systems. Also responsible, though, are barriers related to the international trade structure, LDCs' lack of market access and developed countries' domestic economic policies.

**Table 5.1. Average tariffs (%) imposed by developed countries on goods commonly produced in LDCs**

| | 2000 | 2002 |
|---|---|---|
| Agricultural products | 2.5 | 3.2 |
| Textiles | 3.8 | 3.6 |
| Clothing | 8.1 | 8.3 |

*Source: UN DESA, "Progress of the Least Developed Countries on the Millennium Development Goals," 23 June 2004.*

Tariffs and quotas in the international trade regime limit the ability of many LDCs to gain access to much-needed markets or to diversify towards high value-added processed goods. Peak tariff rates of about 15 percent are often concentrated in goods such as agricultural products, clothing and textiles, which are major exports from developing countries. The relatively high rates, which are designed to protect producers in developed countries, also have the effect of restricting imports from LDCs. The average tariff imposed by developed countries on agricultural products and clothing increased for LDCs between 2000 and 2002 (see Table 5.1), and declined marginally for textiles. The World Bank

[243] World Bank, "World Development Indicators 2005," The data are in constant 2000 US dollars. Online: http://publications.worldbank.org/WDI/ .

[244] United Nations General Assembly, "Implementation of the Monterrey Consensus: A Regional Perspective," Note by the Secretary-General, 27 May 2005, p. 8.

[245] World Bank, "World Development Indicators 2005," online: http://publications.worldbank.org/WDI/ ; UNDP, "Human Development Report 2005: International Cooperation at Crossroads: Aid, Trade, and Security in an Unequal World," 2005; Infoplease 2005, online: www.infoplease.com/countries.html.

[246] See UNESCO Website Indicators 2005. Online: www.uis.unesco.org/ev.php?URL_ID=5187&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.

[247] World Bank, "World Development Indicators 2005." Online: http://publications.worldbank.org/WDI/.

[248] UNDP, "Human Development Report 2005: International Cooperation at Crossroads: Aid, Trade, and Security in an Unequal World," 2005, p. 4.

estimates that in African non–oil exporting countries (excluding South Africa), the cumulative losses resulting from the adverse terms of trade over nearly three decades (1970-1997) amounted to 119 percent of the combined GDP of these countries in 1997. Compared with 1980, the overall terms of trade have deteriorated for 17 LDCs.[249]

Subsidies for agriculture producers in the developed countries also act to keep out exports from developing countries. For example, cotton subsidies in the United States and the European Union caused a loss of up to $300 million in revenue to African cotton-producing countries in 1997. This amount is greater than the total debt relief ($230 million) approved by the World Bank and IMF under the HIPC (heavily indebted poor countries) debt-relief initiative to nine cotton export countries in West Central Africa that same year.[250] Additionally, the wide gap between prices paid by final consumers and those received by producers means that although business in several commodities from the African LDCs has been booming, profits are not being shared with the LDC producers.[251] According to the International Coffee Organization, earnings by coffee-producing countries were between $10 billion and $12 billion in the early 1990s, while the value of retail sales was about $30 billion. Ten years later, the value of retail sales had soared to $70 billion, but revenues to producers had halved, to about $5.5 billion.[252]

**Preferential market access and special and differential treatment of LDCshave been the cornerstone of the BPoA, WTO's ongoing Doha Round and theMillennium Declarations**

There are indications that developed countries recognize that these disparities need to be rectified. Preferential market access and special and differential treatment of LDCs have been the cornerstone of the BPoA, WTO's ongoing Doha Round and the Millennium Declarations. Some 35 WTO members and observers, counting 25 EU members as one, have undertaken measures to improve market access for LDCs under the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP), the Global System of Trade Preferences, and special trade preferences for LDCs such as the EU's Everything but Arms (EBA) initiative and the US African Growth Opportunity Act (AGOA).[253] However, half of the market-access preferences granted under these schemes remain underutilized by LDCs, mainly because of their lingering supply-side constraints, lack of trade-related capacity, and non-tariff barriers such as rules of origin and product standards.

Furthermore, the impact of these schemes varies. For example, EBA beneficiaries show a sectoral basis for gains, with Malawi, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zambia being the main winners. Under that initiative, products that matter most to a number of other LDCs will be liberalized only in 2006 (bananas) or 2009 (rice and sugar). Similarly, under AGOA, only 9 percent of exports from Ethiopia and 4.3 percent from Uganda enter the United States under this scheme, compared with 90 percent from Mozambique and 95 percent from Lesotho. Even with AGOA, African exports account for only 0.2 percent of all US imports, which means that the value of agricultural and

[249] See UN DESA, "Progress of the Least Developed Countries on the Millennium Development Goals," 23 June 2004, online: www.un.org/ohrlls/ ; UN DESA, Millennium Indicators Database, online: http://mileniumindicators.un.org.

[250] UNCTAD, "Economic Development in Africa: Trade Performance and Commodity Dependence," 2003, p. 25.

[251] Ibid., p. 24.

[252] Tadesse Woldemariam Gole, "Conservation and Use of Coffee Genetic Resources in Ethiopia: Challenges and Opportunities in the Context of Current Global Situations," p. 12; online: www.gdnet.org/pdf/2002AwardsMedalsWinners/HealthEnvironmentDevelopment/tadesse_gole_paper.pdf.

[253] As of November 2005, for example, the United States exempted imports from LDCs from tariffs and quotas in 83% of its more than 2,000 import categories; Japan exempted them from 87% of its import categories; and the EU exempted them from all categories except sugar, bananas, rice and arms.

food exports to the United States from all African countries was only $1.12 billion, as per estimates from 2003.[254] (The country most affected by US trade barriers is Bangladesh, because 90 percent of its exports are among the 20 main products not covered by the US GSP. Cambodia and Nepal are also significantly affected for similar reasons.[255]

Termination of WTO's Agreement on Textile and Clothing in January 2005 raised serious concerns among LDCs reliant on textile exports. Preliminary studies suggested that the Asian LDCs, which have the strongest textile export specialization, would be most affected.[256] There is also a significant gender dimension given that most workers in garment industries are women. Closing enterprises and laying off workers would affect women more significantly, thus resulting in different kinds of economic and social problems.[257] The ultimate impact of the phasing out of the Agreement on Textile and Clothing will depend, however, on whether the unilaterally granted preferential market access for LDCs can counterbalance its negative effects.

## Flow of financial and human resources

Many LDC governments still depend heavily on foreign aid and some changes in the pattern are in order. For example, ODA accounts for more than 50 percent of Uganda's budget, 60 percent of Rwanda's and 70 percent of Mozambique's.[258] While at an all-time high, ODA remains at a historically low level as a share of donor country income. Most donors are below the BPoA target of more than 0.20 percent net ODA of their respective GNI in 2002 (see Table 5.2). Increasing ODA has yet to raise real transfers to poor countries: nominal net ODA flows to LDCs per capita have risen by more than one third since 1999; but in real terms, net aid flows per capita were about 16 percent lower in 2002 than in the early 1990s.[259] The proportion of ODA provided to help build trade capacity of LDCs is only 1.5 percent of total ODA. Finally, ODA directed at achieving the MDGs is not expected to fill the projected resource gap (see Table 5.3).

**Table 5.2. Net ODA to LDCs, 1990-2002**

| | 1990 | 2002 |
|---|---|---|
| As percentage of donors' GNI | 0.09 | 0.06 |
| As percentage of total ODA | 28 | 26 |
| As percentage of total ODA to developing countries | 32 | 30 |
| As percentage of LDCs' GDP | 12 | 9 |

*Source: UN DESA, "Progress of the Least Developed Countries on the Millennium Development Goals," June 2004.*

Net foreign direct investment (FDI) to LDCs totalled less than 3 percent of their GDP in 2003, and other capital flows added up to less than 0.5 percent.[260] The limited

[254] Andrew Mold, "Trade Preferences and Africa: The State of Play and the Issues at Stake," ATPC Work in Progress No. 12, UN ECA, March 2005.

[255] UN ESCAP and UNDP, *Voices of the Least Developed Countries of Asia and the Pacific: Achieving the Millennium Development Goals through a Global Partnership*, New Delhi, India: Elsevier, 2005: p. 19; UNCTAD, "Handbook of Statistics," 2004, online: www.unctad.org/en/docs/tdstat29_enfr.

[256] Hafiz Pasha, "When Textile Quotas Disappear," *International Herald Tribune*, 30 December 2004.

[257] Selim Jahan, "Reorienting Development: Towards an Engendered Employment Strategy," UNDP, 2004, p. 4, Online: www.undp.org/poverty/docs/gender-employment-delhi.doc.

[258] UN ECA, "Economic Report on Africa 2003: Accelerating the Pace of Development," 2003, p. 7.

[259] Statement by Habib Ouane, Head, Special Programme for Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States, UNCTAD at the ECOSOC High-Level Segment Preparatory Meeting UN Headquarters, New York, 17 February 2004.

[260] UN ECA, "Economic Report on Africa 2003: Accelerating the Pace of Development," 2003, p. 2.

**Table 5.3. Estimated MDG investment needs and financing gaps (in 2003 US$) in Asia-Pacific LDCs**

| | Projected for 2006 | | Projected for 2010 | | Projected for 2015 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total (billions) | Per capita | Total (billions) | Per capita | Total (billions) | Per capita |
| Total investment needs to meet MDGs | 20.7 | 76 | 31.0 | 104 | 47.3 | 145 |
| Domestic financing | 8.7 | 31 | 13.3 | 45 | 21.1 | 65 |
| ODA for direct support for MDGs | 1.9 | 7 | 2.0 | 7 | 2.2 | 7 |
| Total shortfall | 10.1 | 37 | 15.7 | 52 | 24.0 | 73 |

*Source: ESCAP and UNDP,* Voices of the Least Developed Countries of Asia and the Pacific: Achieving the Millennium Development Goals through a Global partnership. *Delhi, India: Elsevier, 2005.*

flow of capital remains a problem that contributes to the low rates of saving and investment in LDCs. The net FDI flows to sub-Saharan Africa, for example, were $8 billion in 2003, and even this limited flow was concentrated in a few countries, namely non-LDCs. While past low levels of capital flow were related to substandard economic and political governance in LDCs, which made doing business risky and difficult, today's context of improved governance in many LDCs should lead to a greater flow of external investment and capital flow. Higher levels of capital flow and investment are required for economic growth and the nurturing of the still nascent and weak private sectors in many LDCs. However, increasing investment will not automatically mean economic growth unless it is accompanied by improved efficiency of resource use.

**increasing investment will not automatically mean economic growth unless it is accompanied by improved efficiency of resource use**

The situation is the opposite in terms of capital outflow. According to the Economic Commission for Africa (UN ECA), capital flight over the past 27 years in 30 African countries amounted to about $187 billion. Countries such as Angola and the Democratic Republic of the Congo had the highest stocks of capital flight. The UN ECA data further show that roughly 80 cents on every US dollar that flowed into Africa from foreign loans flowed back out as capital flight in the same year, suggesting widespread capital flight fuelled by debt.[261]

Lack of migration opportunities and barriers to movement of labour, particularly unskilled labour from LDCs, continue to constrain the development efforts of many of these countries. The labour force in most LDCs is extremely segmented: highly skilled people can and do compete in the global labour market, but unskilled people have problems selling their services even within their national boundaries. Brain drain continues to erode human capital in LDCs. Since 1990, Africa has been losing 23,000 professionals annually; today, some 300,000 African-born professionals reside outside of the continent. Between 1980 and 1991, Ethiopia lost 75 percent of its skilled workforce. To fill in the human resource gap created by brain drain, Africa employs 150,000 expatriate professionals at a cost of $4 billion per year.[262] The reverse brain drain, which is now enriching countries such as China and India, is not happening in LDCs — where the traffic is one-way. Given that so many of their citizens are living abroad, LDCs should more aggressively address in global forums the issues of remittances and the welfare of overseas labour.

[261] Population Research Group, "Brain Drain in Africa," University of Natal, South Africa, October 2001.

[262] World Bank, "World Development Indicators 2005." Online: http://publications.worldbank.org/WDI/.

## Debt burden and debt relief

The debt burden has become unsustainable in many LDCs, crippling governments and limiting their ability to provide basic services and public goods to their citizens as well as undermining economic growth. For LDCs as a whole, the debt-servicing ratio is about 6.81 percent of exports of goods and services. For some individual countries, however, it is extremely high — 65.7 percent for Burundi, 27.6 percent for Mauritania, 30.8 percent for São Tomé and Principe, and 29.5 percent for Zambia.[263] These high debt-servicing ratios clearly indicate that LDCs do not have enough resources to channel to important social welfare issues like health, education, nutrition and human security. Important resources that can be oriented towards reducing the number of children dying of treatable or preventable diseases are used for debt servicing. For example, for some LDCs, debt-service payments are nine times their primary health expenditure and four times their primary education expenditure.

**high debt-servicing ratios clearly indicate that LDCs do not have enough resources to channel to important social welfare issues like health, education, nutrition and human security**

Many developed countries and international financial institutions recognize the deleterious effects that debt servicing can have on citizens and human development in developing nations. In response, they have bilaterally and multilaterally agreed on debt-reduction and cancellation arrangements. For example, in order to address problems of aid and debt, the HIPC initiative of the Bretton Woods institutions (the World Bank and the IMF) has attempted to stabilize the ratio of external debt to exports. While this is a step in the right direction, it must be kept in mind that fiscal sustainability goes beyond the country's external debt to the sustainability of aggregate public-sector debt, including both foreign and domestic debt. The established debt-sustainability ratio and the short window of opportunity for countries to become eligible for the HIPC initiative do not allow these countries the support and the breathing space needed to restore growth and accelerated human development. For example, in Uganda, the first country to graduate from the enhanced HIPC programme in 2000, the net present value of debt to exports ratio increased from 170 percent in 2001 to 200 percent in 2002, and is projected to increase to 208 percent in 2003 — all levels that are well above the HIPC threshold of 150 percent. Terms of trade losses have also contributed to the debt overhang of African countries. The IMF claims that "almost all countries hit hardest by falling commodity prices are also among the world's poorest…over half are sub-Saharan Africa and 16 are HIPC." [264]

The HIPC initiative is aimed at providing debt relief to heavily indebted countries. Of the 38 nations currently considered to be a heavily indebted poor country (and thus potentially eligible for the initiative), 32 are in sub-Saharan Africa. Two Asian LDCs — the Lao PDR and Myanmar — are included on the list. However, based on standard World Bank definitions of indebtedness, three Asian and Pacific countries — the Lao PDR, Myanmar and Samoa — are classified as severely indebted, and two others (Cambodia and Solomon Islands) as moderately indebted.

Table 5.4 presents per capita outstanding debt and debt relief to LDCs in 2002. The table emphasizes two fundamental points: first, that the debt relief in general is insignificant compared with debt burden, and second, that the relative debt burden of African LDCs and the debt relief enjoyed by them is much higher than those of their Asian

[263] UNCTAD (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development), *Economic Development in Africa: Trade Performance and Commodity Dependence*, United Nations: New York; Geneva, 2003: p. 20

[264] ESCAP; UNDP Voices *of the Least Developed Countries of Asia and the Pacific: Achieving the Millennium Development Goals through a Global partnership*: Delhi, India: Elsevier, 2005: p. 26.

counterparts. At the country level, debt-to-GDP ratio and per capita outstanding debt remain quite high in some Asia-Pacific nations as well, including the Lao PDR (146 percent debt-to-GDP ration and $471 per capita outstanding debt), Vanuatu (71 percent, $785) and Maldives (41 percent, $830).[265]

Will debt relief work in terms of generating resources for LDCs? Most people seem to think that it is unlikely to free up sufficient resources for LDCs for three main reasons:

- First, several LDCs with significant debt burdens are not included in the initiative. The reason they are excluded is that the threshold levels to measure debt sustainability are arbitrary and still too high. A related problem is that sustainability is defined in economic terms and not in terms of human and social development, despite the fact that many in the international community think that debt needs to be seen in a broader context and that a human development perspective should be incorporated into the HIPC initiative.

**Table 5.4. Per capita outstanding debt and debt relief granted to LDCs, 2002**

| | Outstanding debt per capita | | Debt relief per capita | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | US$ | Ratio (b/a) | US$ | Ratio (b/a) |
| Asia-Pacific LDCs (a) | 150 | - | 0.16 | - |
| Other LDCs (b) | 255 | 1.7 | 1.64 | 10.3 |

*Source: UNDP, "The G8 summit: The Aid Equation," 2005, p. 8, online: http://doku.cac.at/undp_hdr2005_note_aid.pdf.*

- Second, the debt reduction being offered is too small. Niger and Zambia will actually pay more after the initiative than they did before. In addition, some countries will see significant volatility in debt servicing, which will severely disrupt government budget processes. For 11 of the 13 HIPC-LDCs for which post-2005 debt service data are available, debt service starts to increase after 2005; for 9 of the 13, meanwhile, anticipated future debt-service levels are far above present levels.[266]
- Third, far too many conditions have been attached to the initiative. The introduction of the PRSP as a condition for debt relief, for example, not only involves a change of emphasis but also an extension of policy conditions. Many LDCs find themselves trying to meet various different yardsticks and measures to fulfil their commitments.

**Of all the development challenges facing us today, HIV/AIDS is perhaps the most urgent and global in nature. It knows no borders, national income, race, age or gender.**

## HIV/AIDS and global governance

Of all the development challenges facing us today, HIV/AIDS is perhaps the most urgent and global in nature.[267] It knows no borders, national income, race, age or gender. Addressing the epidemic requires international, regional, national and local multi-sectoral initiatives embedded in a process of participatory partnerships.

Extensive international and national fiscal mobilization has long been needed. Fortunately, after years of avoidance and foot-dragging, recently there has been an unprecedented increase in global financial resources devoted to the epidemic. The total amount of money allocated to the HIV/AIDS response around the world increased from

[265] Ibid.

[266] See Eurodad / WIDER Development Conference on Debt Relief, "Debt Reduction for Poverty Eradication in the Least Developed Countries: Analysis and Recommendations on LDC Debt," July 2001, online: www.wider.unu.edu/conference/conference-2001-2/poster%20papers/EURODAD%20Mills.pdf.

[267] See UN-OHRLLS and UNDP, "Hoping and Coping: A Call for Action. The Capacity Challenge of HIV/AIDS in Least Developed Countries," 2005; UN-OHRLLS and UNDP, Hope: Building Capacity. Least Developed Countries Meet the HIV/AIDS Challenge," 2005.

$300 million in 1996 to an estimated $4.7 billion in 2003. These figures include funding from national governments as well as "out of pocket" spending by directly affected individuals and families. Even the substantially higher recent amounts are insufficient, however; they total only a quarter of what is likely to be required in 2007.[268]

Effective fiscal mobilization on its own is not an adequate response, however. Improved access to treatment for the millions of people living with HIV is equally vital. Access to medicines for HIV/AIDS and other diseases that primarily affect the poor and vulnerable has emerged as a major public health issue, especially given the impact of patents on the prices of many of these urgently needed drugs. Enforcement of WTO's TRIPS provisions, which aim to protect patents, has restricted the availability of essential medicines in many countries because many drugs' prices remain unaffordable for public health systems and patients. A year's supply of HIV/AIDS treatment using patented drugs costs from $10,000-$15,000 per person in developed countries. Costs are much lower — about $200 per person per year for the most basic treatment combinations — in developing countries where generic versions are available. However, global trade rules continue to stymie efforts to export needed quantities of generic drugs to many LDCs.[269]

The Doha Declaration on the TRIPS Agreement and Public Health, released at the WTO Ministerial Conference in 2001, emphasized the placement of public health needs first and foremost. The Doha Declaration reaffirmed that the TRIPS agreement does not prevent members from taking measures to protect public health; the agreement can be interpreted, for example in a manner supportive of WTO members' right to protect public health and, in particular, to promote access to medicines for all. These flexibilities allow countries to locally manufacture generic drugs with compulsory licenses as well as import and export them on a limited basis and in certain special circumstances (such as when they have declared a "public health emergency." Given that many of the nations most in need of HIV/AIDS medicines have insufficient or nonexistent drug-manufacturing capacities, a temporary waiver was issued to allow eligible countries to import unlimitedly. However, problems still remain with this arrangement because the eligibility requirements are difficult for many companies and governments to comply with. Moreover, various bilateral and regional trade agreements have already imposed strict intellectual property rights laws on several LDCs — passing and enforcing such laws are a condition of membership in the trade pacts — that are de facto TRIPS compliant already.[270]

**An average of $22 billion is spent on arms by countries in Africa, Asia, the Middle East and Latin America - a sum that would otherwise enable most LDCs to meet the MDGs**

## Armed conflict

Conflict in today's globalized world is not only about lost lives, lost livelihoods and lost opportunities to escape poverty. It is also about a booming arms trade business that fuels and maintains these conflicts, regardless of the outcomes. An average of $22 billion is spent on arms by countries in Africa, Asia, the Middle East and Latin America — a sum that would otherwise enable most LDCs to meet the MDGs of universal primary education and reduced infant and maternal mortality. The uncontrolled proliferation of small arms and light weapons has contributed to incidences of armed conflicts by inciting outbreaks of violence, increasing tension, and escalating and/or prolonging conflict.

[268] UNAIDS, "2004 Report on the Global AIDS Epidemic; Overcoming AIDS: The 'Next Agenda'," p. 133.

[269] UN ECA, "Scaling Up AIDS Treatment in Africa: Issues and Challenges," 2004, online: www.uneca.org/chga/botswana/scaling%20up_bg_nw_2.pdf.

[270] UNAIDS, "2004 Report on the Global AIDS Epidemic; Overcoming AIDS: The 'Next Agenda'," pp. 118-119.

The world's most powerful governments are also the world's biggest arms suppliers, accounting for 88 percent of the world's conventional arms exports.[271] Most of these weapons are exported to developing nations. The value of all arms transfer agreements involving the developed countries in 2003 was more than $13.7 billion, and the value of all arms deliveries was nearly $17 billion during the same year.[272]

Trade in small arms is highly intricate and fraught with challenges related to regulation, transparency and accountability. These weapons are of special concern because they are relatively affordable to non-state actors and easy to transport, conceal and smuggle into conflict areas. Most national arms controls are riddled with loopholes and barely enforced; as a result, access to arms is relatively easy throughout the world, including in conflict zones and countries with poor human rights records and high levels of organized crime — and even to countries embargoed by the UN, such Afghanistan, Angola, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Sierra Leone, to name a few.[273] One of the key features of the arms trade is the permeable boundary between the legal and illegal spheres of sale. The current campaign to tackle small arms trade does not target the legal market even though most illegal weapons originate in the legal sphere, facilitated by third country arms brokering that is unaccountable to both national and international legal systems because of a lack of effective legislation. Arms also are recycled from one conflict to another, usually after a peace treaty when arms are not collected from ex-combatants. Additionally, many developed countries supply arms to police and security forces in countries where human rights and the rule of law are routinely violated. These forces often turn around and sell the weapons illegally for personal gain.

Conflict-ridden LDCs need support from the global community to address myriad problems and issues, including refugees and internally displaced people, basic service delivery, addressing the needs of women and children during conflicts and post-conflicts situations, the issue of returnees and their rehabilitations, and the transition to peace and development. It is true that bilateral and multilateral donors and international organizations are doing a lot in LDCs in all of these areas. But conflict prevention and peace and recovery efforts need to be part of the ongoing global dialogue because they have serious implications for LDCs that have been, are or will be in conflicts.

**LDCs are acutely vulnerable to a variety of natural shocks, including natural disasters, and severe structural handicaps**

## Global environmental issues

Long-term threats to the global environment are a common concern of all countries and the responsibility belongs to all countries as well. LDCs are acutely vulnerable to a variety of natural shocks, including natural disasters, and severe structural handicaps. They are susceptible to global environmental phenomena such as the loss of biological diversity and adverse effects of climate change that *inter alia* exacerbate drought, desertification and sea level rise. Other global environmental degradations that affect LDCs include acid rain, production of greenhouse gases, forest fires, contamination of international waters and transnational logging. In many cases, these countries are not the causes of

[271] OXFAM International and Amnesty International, *Shattered Lives: The Case for Tough International Arms Control*, London, UK, 2003.

[272] Richard F. Grimmett, "Conventional Arms Transfer to Developing Nations, 1996-2003." [CRS Report for Congress RL32547], Congressional Research Service, The Library of Congress, 2004.

[273] OXFAM International and Amnesty International, *Shattered Lives: The Case for Tough International Arms Control*, London, UK, 2003.

such degradations but nonetheless are victimized by them. For example, Bangladesh contributes only 0.3 percent of global emissions, but with a one meter rise in sea level due to global warming, it could see its land area shrink by 17 percent.[274] Moderate to severe desertification affects about 73 percent of land in Africa, home of 34 LDCs. Desertification shaves off some $9 billion a year from the continent-wide GDP in Africa alone. There is now increased awareness of the relationship linking desertification with movements of people and conflicts. In Africa, many people have become internally displaced or forced to migrate to other countries due to war, drought and soil impoverishment. The environmental resources in and around the cities and camps where these people settle come under severe pressure. Difficult living conditions and the loss of cultural identity further undermine social stability. Nearly a third of the world's people — almost all of them poor — depend directly on what they grow, gather and catch.[275] Loss of transnational biodiversity is threatening their livelihoods and life.

**Nearly a third of the world's people - almost all of them poor - depend directly on what they grow, gather and catch. Loss of transnational biodiversity is threatening their livelihoods and life.**

In some cases, sharing of natural resources from global commons can cause conflicts among countries in a region or sub-region. Disagreements over water already are common (e.g., between Bangladesh and India), and water will be a major source of conflicts around the world in the coming years, with many LDCs involved. Forest resources can be another issue of contention. Unilateral action by some countries causes environmental problems for their neighbours — for example, as a result of India's Farakkah barrage river-linking project on the Ganges, agricultural lands are being dried up in the northern part of Bangladesh.

### Global 'bads'

There are several notable global "bads" that affect LDCs significantly. A number of LDCs are on key drug-trafficking routes, which means they are highly susceptible to the violent crime and corruption that often accompany the drug trade. Worldwide, organized crime is a $1.5 trillion business with direct and indirect implications for LDCs.

Over the past decade, trafficking in human beings has reached epidemic proportions. Trafficking in human beings is a crime in which victims are moved from poor environments to more affluent ones, with the profits flowing in the opposite direction, a pattern often repeated at the domestic, regional and global levels. The search for work abroad has been fuelled by economic disparity, high unemployment and the disruption of traditional livelihoods. Traffickers can earn huge profits by taking advantage of large numbers of potential immigrants. In Asia, girls from villages in Nepal and Bangladesh — the majority of whom are under 18 — are sold to brothels in India. Europol estimates that the industry is now worth several billion US dollars a year. Trafficking in human beings is not confined to the sex industry. UNICEF estimates that more than 200,000 children are enslaved by cross-border smuggling in West and Central Africa. The children are often "sold" by unsuspecting parents who believe their children are going to be looked after, learn a trade or be educated. In many cases, trafficking patterns are also related to conflict situations as combatants (or even peacekeepers) create a market for the services of victims, and the effects of conflict erode the capacity of law enforcement and other authorities to combat the problem.[276]

---

[274] UNDP, "Human Development Report 1998," p. 4.

[275] See UNCCD (United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification), online: www.unccd.int/actionprogrammes/africa/africa.php.

[276] See www.unodc.org/unodc/en/trafficking_human_beings.html.

# Global governance structure and LDCs

**the global governance structure represents a system with unequal rules - situation that results in unfavourable conditions for countries that have insufficient representation and ineffective participation**

For LDCs, the global governance structure represents a system with unequal rules —situation that results in unfavourable conditions for countries that have insufficient representation and ineffective participation. Part of the problem is related to the systems in place (e.g., in areas of rules and representation), while another part is related to lack of proper capacities (e.g., in the area of participation) in LDCs. As a result, these countries cannot take advantage of the opportunities offered by the global system and at the same time they are unprotected from the vulnerabilities caused by globalization.

## Unfavourable rules and insufficient representation

Large inequalities in economic power and influence are embedded in most international institutions. Often this is justified on the grounds that those with the largest stake in the outcomes have most to lose — and that they must have greater influence to ensure responsible decisions. If stake means financial outcomes, that is true. But if stake refers to the number of people affected, often negatively, then that justification looks very thin (see Table 5.5). Although developing countries are deeply affected by the decisions of institutions such as the IMF, World Bank and WTO, they have little power in their decision-making (see Table 5.6). Furthermore, although all countries have a seat and a vote in WTO, actual decision-making occurs within small group meetings that are heavily influenced by a few countries; most developing countries are usually excluded. In addition to the formal process, the informal processes further favour the industrial countries. Serious gaps in transparency remain a major concern.

**Table 5.5. Global institutions and their membership**

| Institutions | Share of global GDP (%) | Share of global population (%) |
|---|---|---|
| P-5 Security Council | 41 | 31 |
| G7 economic powers (a) | 64 | 12 |
| G22 economic powers and emerging countries | 82 | 65 |
| G24 major developing countries | 9 | 35 |
| G77 developing and transition countries | 17 | 76 |

Note: (a) The G7 expanded to the G8 with the addition of Russia in the 1990s. Data here do not include Russia.

*Source: UNDP, "Human Development Report 1999."*

**Table 5.6. Voting power in Bretton Woods institutions**

| | Voting power at the World Bank | Voting power at the IMF |
|---|---|---|
| China, France, Japan, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, the United Kingdom and the United States | 46% | 48% |
| Rest of the world | 54% | 52% |

*Source: UNDP, "Human Development Report 2002: Deepening Democracy in a Fragmented World."*

Even though high and medium human development countries constitute nearly three fourths of the countries in the world, they are not proportionately represented in global negotiations. For example, in negotiations on the international undertaking on plant generic resources, their representation was less than half; in negotiations on the Convention of Biological Diversity, it was a little more than one third. The worldwide core of the internet, known as the domain name system, is administered by one US-based non-profit organization, the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers.

### Ineffective participation

Integrating LDCs into the global economy requires their voice and effective participation in the rule-based multilateral trading system. However, accession of LDCs to WTO has been hampered by a number of factors: sustained policy issues related to adjustment of LDCs' development strategies; implementing instruments and legislative framework related to WTO requirements; insufficient knowledge, expertise, resources, infrastructure and analytical capacities required for accession negotiations; and increasing demands by some WTO members for a higher level of obligations and commitments from the acceding countries. Despite the adoption of simplified and streamlined procedures by the WTO General Council in 2002, LDCs' accession remains a protracted and complex procedure. So far, only two LDCs (Cambodia and Nepal) have joined WTO in the post-Doha period, bringing the total number of LDCs in WTO to 32. Another nine LDCs remain in different stages of accession process. Some of them have been in this process for nearly a decade and are nowhere near its completion. Even if they join, however, it is unclear how beneficial membership will be. The WTO accession commitments for a number of LDCs could result in resources being diverted from needed expenditures on health, education and infrastructure.

**Integrating LDCs into the global economy requires their voice and effective participation in the rule-based multilateral trading system**

Many LDCs lack the capacity to negotiate complex and often highly legal processes due to constrained human and financial resources — limitations that are especially damning in trade negotiations. For example, in 2000, as many as 15 African countries did not have a representative at WTO headquarters. At one point, 29 African nations with permanent missions in Geneva only had one person to deal with all the UN agencies and diverse issues. Without sufficient capacities to do the homework and pursue follow-up actions, these countries can hardly be expected to participate effectively in global forums. This shortfall has become even more complex as some of the global negotiations have become highly technical and complex. Issues like TRIPS, environmental standards and procurement need solid substantive knowledge to produce positive results for LDCs.

For effective participation in global forums, good substantive work and coordinated action are needed at the country level also. Frequently, however, policy makers, legislators and politicians in LDCs seem unaware of the important global issues that have major implications for their countries. In many cases, a lack of knowledge of the WTO negotiating process means that countries are forced to change their domestic policies as a result of agreements that are not fully understood. Global management also suffers because of a lack of consistency between positions taken by various ministries and missions abroad.

## Box 5.1. 2005 World Summit Outcomes

At a meeting at United Nations Headquarters in New York on 14-16 September 2005, world leaders agreed to take action on a range of global issues, most of them of great significance for LDCs, including:

- MDGs: resolved to adopt, by 2006, and implement comprehensive national development strategies to achieve the internationally agreed development goals and objectives, including the MDGs.
- Financing for development: welcomed the increased resources that will become available on the establishment of timetables by many developed countries to achieve the target of 0.7 per cent of GNP for ODA by 2015 and to reach at least 0.5 per cent of GNP for ODA by 2010 as well as, pursuant to the BPoA, 0.15 per cent to 0.20 per cent for the least developed countries no later than 2010, and urge those developed countries that have not yet done so to make concrete efforts in this regard in accordance with their commitments.
- Investment: underscored the need to sustain sufficient and stable private financial flows to developing countries and countries with economies in transition. It was considered important to promote measures in source and destination countries to improve transparency and the information about financial flows to developing countries, particularly countries in Africa, LDCs, small island developing States and land-locked developing countries. Measures designed to mitigate the impact of excessive volatility of short-term capital flows were deemed important and essential for consideration.
- Debt: stressed the need to consider additional measures to ensure long-term debt sustainability through increased grant-based financing and cancellation of 100 percent of the official multilateral and bilateral debt of heavily indebted poor countries and, where appropriate, and on a case-by-case basis, to consider significant debt relief or restructuring for low- and middle-income developing countries with an unsustainable debt burden that are not part of the HIPC Initiative.
- Trade: committed to efforts designed to ensure that developing countries, especially LDCs, participate fully in the world trading system to meet their economic development needs, and reaffirmed their commitment to enhanced and predictable market access for the exports of developing countries. Leaders pledged duty-free and quota-free market access for all LDCs' products to the markets of developed countries, as well as to the markets of developing countries in a position to do so, and support their efforts to overcome their supply-side constraints. They promised to work expeditiously towards implementing the development dimensions of the Doha work programme.
- Quick-impact initiatives: resolved to urgently identify and implement country-led initiatives with adequate international support, consistent with long-term national development strategies, that promise immediate and durable improvements in the lives of people.
- Environment: recognized the serious challenge posed by climate change and emphasised the need to meet all the commitments and obligations of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change. Leaders committed to action through international cooperation to assist developing countries, in particular small island developing States, LDCs and African countries, including those that are particularly vulnerable to climate change, in addressing their adaptation needs relating to the adverse effects of climate change.

- Countries with special needs: reaffirmed the commitment to address the special needs of LDCs and urged all countries and all relevant organizations of the United Nations system, including the Bretton Woods institutions, to make concerted efforts and adopt speedy measures for meeting in a timely manner the goals and targets of the BPoA for LDCs for the Decade 2001-2010. They reaffirmed their commitment to address the special needs of Africa, which is the only continent not on track to meet any of the goals of The Millennium Declaration by 2015, and resolved to strengthen cooperation with the New Partnership for Africa's Development.
- Human rights: resolved to strengthen the UN human rights machinery by strengthening the OHCHR and took note of the High Commissioner's plan of action, that called for a doubling of its regular budget resources over the next five years and creating a UN Human Rights Council.
- Democracy: reaffirmed democracy as a universal value and welcomed the establishment of the new Democracy Fund.
- Rule of law: recognized the need for universal adherence to and implementation of the rule of law at both the national and international levels.
- HIV/AIDS, malaria, tuberculosis and other health issues: committed to increasing investment, building on existing mechanisms and through partnership, to improve health systems in developing countries and those with economies in transition with the aim of providing sufficient health workers, infrastructure, management systems and supplies to achieve the health-related MDGs by 2015;
- Humanitarian assistance: supported strengthening the effectiveness of the United Nations humanitarian response, inter alia, by improving the timeliness and predictability of humanitarian funding, in part by improving the Central Emergency Revolving Fund.
- Responsibility to protect populations: accepted the responsibility that each State has to protect its populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. This responsibility entails the prevention of such crimes, including their incitement, through appropriate and necessary means, and accepted to act in accordance with it.
- Terrorism: condemned strongly, terrorism in all its forms and manifestations, committed by whomever, wherever and for whatever purposes, as it constitutes one of the most serious threats to international peace and security. They stressed the need to make every effort to reach an agreement on and conclude a comprehensive convention on international terrorism during the 60th session of the General Assembly.
- Peacekeeping and peacebuilding: urged further development of proposals for enhanced rapidly deployable capacities to reinforce peacekeeping operations in crises. decided to establish a Peacebuilding Commission as an intergovernmental advisory body that brings together all relevant actors to marshal resources and to advise on and propose integrated strategies for post-conflict peacebuilding and recovery. Leaders decided to create a Peace-building Commission, backed by a support office and a standing fund, to help countries transition from war to peace. They agreed on new levels of standing police capacity for UN peacekeeping operations and to strengthen the Secretary-General's capacity for mediation and good offices.

*Source: United Nations General Assembly, "World Summit Outcome," 20 September 2005, A/60/L.1, online: www.un.org/summit2005/documents.html*

# Restructuring global governance — strategies and reforms

In the light of the preceding discussion, the crucial question is what kind of global governance structure is needed if the development challenges of LDCs are to be effectively addressed. With the birth of the United Nations and other global institutions, a global governance system was created that has been in place for more than 50 years. New organizations, new rules, new tools and new actors continue to be involved, but many of the key global governance structures have remained the same from the beginning. It can be safely assumed that changes and reforms are needed in the global governance structure to overcome the development challenges of LDCs. Outcomes from the 2005 World Summit show a positive movement toward addressing the needs of LDCs — especially in Africa, where the risk of not achieving the MDGs is greatest (see Box 5.1). In general, however, restructuring global governance for LDCs still entails three fundamental issues: new perspectives, renewed strategies and institutional reforms.

**restructuring global governance for LDCs still entails three fundamental issues: new perspectives, renewed strategies and institutional reforms**

## New perspectives

Restructuring the global governance system could start with new perspectives based on a set of new principles, the main features of which are:

- putting human concerns and rights at the centre of global governance, which consists of
  - strengthening global ethics and responsibility,
  - bringing principles of human development and social protection into concepts and practice of global economic governance,
  - adopting regional and global agreements to prevent races to the bottom,
  - developing a global code of conduct for multinational corporations and a global forum for their monitoring, and
  - strengthening global commitment to democratic governance;
- reducing human vulnerabilities and protecting poor people, which consists of
  - reducing financial insecurity,
  - protecting people during periods of crisis and adjustments,
  - controlling global "bads",
  - maintaining cultural diversity, and
  - preserving the environment; and
- narrowing global gaps, which consists of
  - promoting a fair and even field,
  - ensuring opportunities for weaker countries, and
  - helping them develop capacities.

Three elements are needed to make global arrangements more effective and more reflective of democratic principles: greater pluralism, which expands the space for all state and non-state actors to influence policies and hold powerful actors accountable; increased representation, transparency and accountability in decision-making; and fair and equitable opportunities and rules to allow for the effective participation of all stakeholders. However, all these elements require political will from major power brokers in favour of greater equity for LDCs.

### Renewed strategies

Renewed strategies for global governance would properly address a range of development challenges that LDCs face at the global level. Among them are issues related to trade, financial flows, ODA, migration and brain drain, environmental concerns and global "bads."

### Trade and market access

In areas of trade opportunities and market access, capacities have to be developed both on the supply and demand sides. On the supply side, many LDC economies, particularly in Africa, may benefit from diversifying their exports from the current predominant dependence on primary commodity exports. Such lack of diversification exists also in most Small Island States, where agriculture still remains a major export sector. Other important capacity development issues on the supply side include development of workers' skills, improved working conditions and quality control. All these issues could be addressed through strategies emphasizing institutional reforms and better integration with broader development agenda.

On the demand side, a number of measures can be considered:

- Global zero-tariff market access for LDCs is an important priority goal. The establishment of quota-free and duty-free schemes for all products from LDCs would contribute enormously to raising export earnings and make trade work for human development. Existing preferential schemes for some LDCs could be extended to all of them.
- Easing the rules of origin for LDC exports would improve the utilization rate, defined as the ratio of imports actually receiving preferences to imports covered by a given preferential scheme.
- LDCs affected by the elimination of quotas on textile and clothing may need financial and technical assistance to cover the shortfall. Also helpful would be extending existing preference systems for textile and clothing from LDCs and refocusing other trade preferences. All these steps would help mitigate the harsh impacts of the phasing out of the ACT.
- Intra-regional cooperation and trading among LDCs could be beneficial to all concerned. Steps have already been made in this direction through the merging of a large number of regional trading arrangements. These include the South Asian Free Trade Area (SAFTA) and Association of South-East Asian Nations Free Trade Area (AFTA) in Asia, and the East African Community (EAC), the Economic Commission for West Africa (ECOWAS) and the South African Customs Union (SACU) in Africa.

**The establishment of quota-free and duty-free schemes for all products from LDCs would contribute enormously to raising export earnings and make trade work for human development**

In general, capacity development is required in LDCs to improve their understanding of these issues and to create conditions in which LDCs formulate views and positions on them. Capacities need to be developed, for example, to enable LDCs to participate meaningfully in different negotiations and trade arrangements. Nine African LDCs have participated in the Joint Integrated Technical Assistance Programme (JITAP) aimed at developing capacities of African countries for their effective participation in the multilateral trading system. Trade facilitation programmes, such as the Customs Automation and Modernization Programme, can benefit LDCs. A number of LDCs have benefited from these programmes, including Bangladesh, Benin, Cape Verde, Togo and Uganda. UNCTAD has been providing training in this area.

Specific measures, including concessionary trade measures, would be helpful for landlocked and small island LDCs. These countries face unique geophysical constraints that, in combination with developed countries' trade policies, limit their participation in

world trade. Landlocked countries without direct access to the sea require transport infrastructure, market integration and trade facilitation and harmonization measures at the regional level before they are able to conduct international trade.[277]

The Almaty Programme of Action, adopted at the International Ministerial Conference on Transit Transport Cooperation held in Almaty, Kazakhstan in 2003, provides a comprehensive framework for closer partnerships to enhance the transport efficiency. To assist global integration of landlocked countries, there is also a need to identify and support tradable goods that are low volume and weight with high value, or are otherwise less dependent on expensive transport options. Similar steps would also likely benefit island LDCs, whose small size and remoteness limit the possibilities for economic and export diversification. Island nations are also more vulnerable to environmental risks and natural disasters that affect economic productivity.

More broadly, undertaking the following measures could greatly improve trade and market access among LDCs:

- Integrating trade issues into national development strategies. The Integrated Framework (IF) for Technical Assistance to LDCs is aimed at doing exactly that. The IF covered 27 LDCs by the end of 2005.[278] The IF Diagnostic Trade Integration Study (DTIS) was completed in 2004 in 14 LDCs.
- Increasing regional integration. This would likely serve as a useful a stepping-stone to LDCs' greater integration into the global economy by establishing a unified LDC voice and position in each respective region; providing a larger market; enabling firms to benefit from economies of scale; and creating a competitive environment and guarding against policy reversals — all of which are beneficial, even necessary, for economic growth and human development. There are already some examples of successful LDC regional economic cooperation (see Box 5.2). An important driver of increased exports by developing countries is growing demand from markets in other developing countries. Growth in South-South exports has generally exceeded that of world trade over the past 10 years. From 1990 to 2000, South-South trade grew at an estimated average annual rate of about 10 percent, as compared to 6 percent for world trade (see figure 1). With its strong growth, the share of South-South trade in total world trade climbed from 8 percent to more than 12 percent over the same period. About 40 percent of the South's exports are now to other developing countries. Although four-fifths of these exports occur through intra-Asian trade, strong growth in intraregional trade in Africa and Latin America, albeit from smaller bases, demonstrates that growing South-South trade is not merely an Asian phenomenon. At the same time, interregional trade, although relatively small, is showing signs of accelerated growth.[279]

**An important driver of increased exports by developing countries is growing demand from markets in other developing countries.**

- Assessing the social impact of trade measures and considering the human impacts of opening up economies. Social assessments are particularly useful to identify the additional vulnerabilities faced by female workers in the export sector. Since trade liberalization creates losers as well as winners and introduces risks as well as opportunities, it is

[277] See Statement by Anwarul K. Chowdhury, United Nations Under-Secretary-General and High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States, at the Second Committee of the 60th Session of the UN General Assembly on Agenda Item 50(a): International Trade and Development, 31 October 2005, pp. 3-4.

[278] See www.integratedframework.org.

[279] www.unctad.org/TEMPLATES/Download.asp?docid=5674?=1&intItemID=3315)

## Box 5.2. Regional cooperation among LDCs: Some examples

In Africa, another important regional partnership exists in addition to NEPAD in the African Union. OHADA (Organization pour l'Harmonisation en Afrique du Droit des Affaires) consists of 16 African nations, 14 of which are LDCs. The treaty provides unified, modern business legislation; strengthens legal and judicial security for enterprises; and promotes arbitration to settle contractual disputes. To date, uniform laws have been enacted for general commercial law, corporations and economic interest groups, secured transactions, bankruptcy proceedings and discharge of liabilities, debt collection proceedings, and arbitration.

In Asia, four South Asian LDCs are members of the seven-member South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC). This organization provides for economic cooperation in five broad areas: agriculture, rural development and telecommunications, meteorology and health and population services. Given the fundamental development asymmetry among the member States, economic cooperation has been a complex and gradual process. To date, the member States have begun formulating agreements for a SAARC Preferential Trading Arrangement (SAPTA) and South Asian Free Trade Area (SAFTA). One of the major principles of SAFTA is that there should be special treatment for LDCs in trade arrangements and schemes. Additionally, member States have begun harmonizing economic laws and initiating dialogue to take a regional position in global trade negotiations whenever possible.

Similarly, ASEAN has also made progress in realizing a single ASEAN market and production base by 2020. Member States plan to eliminate duties for 11 priority sectors by 2007 for ASEAN 6 (a sub-group that does not include any LDCs) and 2012 for CLMV (Cambodia, the Lao PDR, Myanmar and Viet Nam). Additionally, ASEAN member States are cooperating on establishing a process for trade disputes, working with other external partners, aligning finance and capital market, protecting workers and others from negative consequences of economic integration and reducing the development gap between the original six countries and CLMV. To achieve these goals, ASEAN leaders adopted the ASEAN Vision 2020 and the Declaration of ASEAN Concord II. Both are geared toward promoting equitable economic development, reducing poverty and economic disparities in the ASEAN region and developing technical cooperation through the Initiative for ASEAN Integration.

*Sources: www.ohada.org; www.saarc-sec.org/main.php; www.aseansec.org; www.southasianmedia.net/Magazine/Journal/previousfour_editorial.htm.*

important to find out what human costs have been borne and what compensatory measures can be undertaken. Criteria need to be established to determine who should be compensated for their losses; the size, nature and methods of compensation should be considered carefully because they have both distortionary and important welfare effects. Resources need to be mobilized to compensate relatively low-income groups that stand to lose from liberalization or that face substantial adjustment costs.

Social impact assessment can also be complementary in devising a trade negotiating approach that will lead to positions and agendas with greater context specificity, more balanced sensitivity to individual country needs, and a timeframe that takes into account analyses of the likely effects of the alternative packages of rules and concessions.

- One key concern with regard to liberalization is the timing and sequencing of opening up the economy. If the timing is wrong, the sequencing incorrect and the whole process too hasty, countries and people may lose more by globalization than they gain.
- Greater coordination among various ministries and agencies within LDCs could help lay the groundwork for consistent positions in global forums. Various mechanisms can

be considered to enhance coordination, including a presidential task force, a special unit attached to the President or the Prime Minister's Office, or a special inter-ministerial unit. Regardless of the mechanism chosen, it must be given the visibility, power and the flexibility — as well as the technical expertise and political clout — to do the job adequately.

### Resource mobilization

**External development partners become apprehensive about supporting LDCs when recipient countries' institutions are dysfunctional, implementation capacity is weak and good governance is lacking.**

Enhancing LDCs' absorptive capacity can increase the effectiveness of external development assistance. A good governance structure — including efficient systems, less corruption, transparency and accountability, and political stability — helps improve this capacity. More specifically, effective absorption of FDI requires simplified rules, one-stop service, conducive incentive structures and skilled labour; for ODA, better aid coordination and management and aligning ODA priorities with national priorities; and for debt relief, a development orientation for the use of debt relief. Incentive mechanisms for external private entrepreneurs should also stress social responsibility, transparency and accountability.

With regard to ODA, a thorough rethinking may be necessary vis-à-vis LDCs. The current declining trend must be reversed; donor priorities should align with national priorities; and more allocations are needed for social welfare areas. More broadly, aid designed to foster good governance could be put to constructive use in poor performers — it need not merely avoid them. A balance can be maintained between rewarding good performers and assisting those that need ODA most. The quality of aid is as important as its quantity, and the issue of aid management and coordination needs to be addressed. All changes in ODA would be particularly helpful if they are geared toward supporting the overall framework of resource mobilization for poverty reduction and achievement of MDGs.

In the area of debt relief, unless HIPC countries receive substantial concessional aid in the future, their public-sector debt is likely to become unsustainable again. Without large volumes of concessional assistance, HIPC countries will inevitably slide back into the debt trap because they will be forced to undertake major fiscal adjustments to achieve sustainability, which will crowd out social expenditure, including poverty alleviation programmes, and create political economy difficulties. Most HIPCs will not attain the MDGs, even though the target deadlines are a decade away, unless they have access to much more foreign resource to complement domestic resources. If foreign assistance is provided as loans, even concessional loans, most HIPCs will not able to service that debt even though their old debts have been reduced.

Resource flows to LDCs will hinge on improved governance. They may therefore need to strengthen their willingness and ability to improve their capacity to deal with concerns such as resource diversion, misallocation, corruption and waste. External development partners become apprehensive about supporting LDCs when recipient countries' institutions are dysfunctional, implementation capacity is weak and good governance is lacking. At the same time, though, it is important to acknowledge that countries characterized by poor governance, weak institutions and insufficient implementation capacities are often those most in need of support. Abandoning them would worsen the situation and make it less likely that they will meet their development challenges. External development partners are urged, therefore, to focus on continuing and constructive engagement with these nations while considering their own role in creating the difficult conditions.

### Migration and brain drain

LDCs' interests in the area of migration are likely to be more thoroughly acknowledged and responded to if raised in all relevant global and regional forums. Institutions like the International Organization on Migration (IOM) can be used to set norms and guidelines designed to protect the rights of overseas workers and ensure their well-being in both sending and receiving countries. On the commercial side, systems for sending remittances and other financial transactions would benefit from simplification and becoming more widely available. One particular area of concern is that of human trafficking, including trafficking of women and girls for prostitution. This problem can be addressed more aggressively through broadly agreed norms, stricter legal frameworks and their implementation, and multinational collaboration of law enforcement agencies.

Brain drain is a complex problem for LDCs. Many people, both in LDCs and elsewhere, have suggested various approaches to deal with the problem. Ultimately, it seems that the most appropriate strategies would be to focus less on trying to stop brain drain and more on assessing how to make positive gains out of it. Several proposals are on the table; they include:

- an exit tax (a tax paid by the employee or the firm in the receiving country at the time the employment visa is granted);
- a flat tax, in which overseas nationals pay a small fraction of their income (perhaps 1 percent) to their home country; and
- a corporate model, in which the multilateral regime would allow automatic inter-governmental transfers of payroll taxes or income taxes paid by nationals of other countries.

All these proposals require serious thought both in terms of their content, trade-offs and institutional implications.

### Global environmental concerns

When considering strategies to deal with global environmental concerns that affect LDCs, the first step is to recognize that they may best be addressed through multinational actions, including the following:

- bilateral and multilateral discussions on global environmental concerns and finding solutions that keep in mind the underlying assumption that solutions need to be beneficial to all concerned;
- participation of LDCs in global environmental discussions and negotiations, including those focusing on issues regarding which they are the victims and not the perpetrators (e.g., greenhouse emissions);
- formulation of regional and sub-regional environmental standards. This would not only harmonize the environmental standards in relevant LDCs, but also would help them take a common stand in trade negotiations when issues related to environmental standards are brought to the table; and
- introduction of permits for greenhouse emissions along the lines explored in the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) proposed in the Kyoto Accord.

**When considering strategies to deal with global environmental concerns that affect LDCs, the first step is to recognize that they may best be addressed through multinational actions**

### Inter-country consortium for transnational highways for landlocked countries

It is widely agreed that transnational highways may bring net benefits not only to landlocked countries but to all the countries through which they pass. But conceptualizing and building such highways brings up a whole series of difficult questions: how should

the issues of design and locations of transnational highways be addressed where multiple nations are involved; who should finance the huge costs associated with construction of such massive infrastructure projects; how should the costs of operations and maintenance be handled; and how should issues of inter-country equity in benefits and costs be addressed given the fact that 1) different levels of benefits may accrue to different countries, and 2) different countries may have different views regarding how all costs (construction as well operations and maintenance) should be borne.

The formation of an inter-country consortium, which is similar to a private-sector joint stock company, is an important first step toward addressing these questions. All countries through which the highway or highways pass should be members of the consortium. Its members should agree on a common standard for the highways' design and construction. Furthermore, members of the consortium can discuss and determine how construction costs as well as costs of operations and maintenance are to be borne by participating countries, based on various agreed-upon formulas. They might consider, for example, the length of highway segments in each country or relative country-specific cost-benefit analyses.

Multilateral lending agencies can be crucial to such projects in a number of ways. Through discussion at a regional or a sub-regional basis, international lending agencies can play a catalytic role in setting up a consortium; they can mediate effectively in deciding on the consortium's rules and regulations, liabilities and responsibilities; and, instead of lending to individual countries, they can lend to the consortium — with clear guidelines as to disbursement of funds and individual countries' responsibilities. External agencies also can serve as guarantor, with their reputation acting as the collateral, which would encourage internal private finance to lend to the consortium. Through such a process of consortium, the credit rating would be on a multi-country basis as opposed to the current single country basis.

Non-lending institutions can also play major roles in several different areas. They can provide the necessary traditional technical assistance at various stages, including design, spatial location, and identification of common standards and common tolls. They can also contribute to capacity development by organizing training and workshops on human resource development, operations and maintenance, financial and administrative management, and knowledge-sharing. Non-lending institutions can also move into new areas such as national capacity-building in contracting, procurement and similar activities.

**The formulation of a regional migration framework ... can contribute greatly to human well-being and development in all countries concerned**

## Regional migration framework

In a globalized world, labour moves across countries in search of enhanced economic opportunities and a better life. But this movement faces several constraints, including lack of proper information, legal barriers imposed by different countries and the absence of a uniform framework for protecting the rights and well-being of migrant workers. As a result, the migration process has become quite dangerous. Illegal trafficking of people, particularly of women for sex work, is widespread, and the human rights of migrant workers, even when they are legal, are constantly violated.

The formulation of a regional migration framework — with rules and norms, processes and modus operandi, and dispute and conflict-resolution mechanisms — can contribute greatly to human well-being and development in all countries concerned. The

process can be initiated through regional discussion and debate on these issues, with participating countries agreeing to and endorsing a framework. A regional monitoring unit can also be established as the watchdog to ensure that the framework is implemented properly and effectively.

Multilateral lending and non-lending organizations can contribute to the formulation and implementation of the framework. Lending organizations can provide funds, or help generate funds by acting as the collateral guarantor, to countries engaged in implementing the framework and also in setting up the monitoring framework. Participating countries would be responsible for paying back the loan. Non-lending organizations can provide technical assistance, such as facilitating regional discussion and agreement, helping build the monitoring unit's capacity and improving knowledge-sharing among all stakeholders.

## Regional and sub-regional common standards

Common standards are important for LDCs to ensure meaningful participation in global negotiations. Their participation is more credible and influential when they are unified in regards to objectives and strategies; in such circumstances, the all-too-frequent divide and rule policy of richer countries becomes ineffective. Common standards can be created in areas such as labour and environmental standards and technology transfers. Broader discussion is needed among LDCs to identify criteria for common standards.

## Institutional reforms

The institutional reforms required in global governance to address LDCs' development challenges consist of strengthening some existing mechanisms, overhauling others and initiating new ones. Some of the broader proposals have been debated and discussed for quite some time.

**Participation, public support and ownership by local actors and governments are vital for international cooperation to work**

### Increased engagement with civil society

Participation, public support and ownership by local actors and governments are vital for international cooperation to work. A new global politics is emerging with the potential to catalyze change and innovation. A significant feature of these new movements is the pressure they exert on politicians and corporations worldwide to respond to the needs of developing countries. Reaching beyond governments to transnational groups, alliances and experts is an important step, as would be the new multi-stakeholder processes stretching beyond mere consultations to encompass a more active role for non-state actors in setting agendas and formulating and monitoring policy. Expanded involvement of NGOs, especially those from developing countries and LDCs, could broaden international decision-making processes. By the end of 2005, only about 250 of the 1,550 NGOs associated with the UN Department of Public Information came from developing countries, and developing country NGOs account for an even smaller share of those in consultative status with the UN Economic and Social Council. It is also important to acknowledge that including civil society organizations in decision-making processes will not have a significant effect if national governments themselves are still excluded from the international decision-making sphere.

**in trade negotiations LDCs are often constrained by their lack of both human and financial capacity**

### Sub-regional legal aid centre for trade negotiations

As has already been mentioned, in trade negotiations LDCs are often constrained by their lack of both human and financial capacity. These constraints can be reduced by the creation of sub-regional legal aid centres providing resources, both financial and human, to poor countries. Such centres may have a small permanent secretariat with trade lawyers and negotiators on a retainer basis so that LDCs can use their services whenever needed in WTO and other trade negotiations. The secretariat can be the catalytic agent in matching demand and supply by considering the needs of countries and the expertise available. The services offered can include interpretation of trade clauses, dispute settlements and financial obligations, including debt relief in favour of poor countries. To summarize, close consideration of the following issues can help to create and sustain viable sub-regional legal aid centres.

- Ownership, reliability and respect are often enhanced when the services are not offered for free. Fees can be established at rates that can be afforded by poor countries.
- Both lending and non-lending multilateral organizations can assist in setting up and running sub-regional legal aid centres for trade negotiations. Lending organizations may, as they have done traditionally, provide the seed money as well as operational funds for such a centre. They may also serve as guarantors of loans. Sub-regional countries are encouraged to draw up a plan for paying back any loans.
- Non-lending institutions may provide technical support for setting up the permanent secretariat, identifying the legal and negotiating expertise in the sub-region and entering into contracts with these experts. At the same time, they can also perform two major broader functions: developing capacity in each country and managing knowledge by sharing the experiences of outcomes and process of various trade negotiations facilitated by the centre.

### Reforms in Bretton Woods institutions

Many people in LDCs do not believe that their interests are represented by international institutions such as the IMF, World Bank and WTO — or that these entities are adequately accountable for what they do. The institutions are often perceived as only representing the narrow interests of and being overly accountable to their most powerful members through both informal and formal processes. However, these issues have long been surrounded by controversy, and open to debate. Therefore, much more fact-based research is needed to guide the direction of reforms in this area.[280] Over the years, the legitimacy of the Bretton Woods institutions has been questioned in three primary areas: their internal governance structures, their policy prescriptions, and their perceived associations with the so-called Washington Consensusv In terms of their internal governance structure, the Bretton Woods institutions have been perceived, on many occasions, to be guided by informal de facto arrangements; to be too close to policy makers in the United States as the world's largest economy; and to be heavily influenced by G8 countries. However, there has been real progress on making the MDGs central to the work of the BWI and the UN and this has become a framework for cooperation at country level. In

[280] For balanced coverage of the issues, see Jagdish Bhagwati, 'In Defense of Globalisation', Oxford University Press, 2004; Joseph E. Stiglitz, 'Globalisation and its Discontents', W.W.Norton & Company, Inc. 2003, 2002.

practice, though, country ownership can be difficult to establish—especially in LDCs, given their greater dependence on these institutions.

For the Bretton Woods institutions, reforms in policies must be linked to reforms in governance. If their governance were perceived to be more legitimate, their policy prescriptions may become more acceptable. But on the policy front also, the institutions should place greater priority on country ownership of recommended strategies and policies.

If the Bretton Woods institutions are to play a major positive role in development in the future, both their governance structure and those of the international economic system must be allowed to change. Increasing gender diversity among the top management would be a good start. Women constitute only 8 percent of the World Bank Board of Directors, and there is no woman on the IMF Board of Directors. Furthermore, the top governance of the international economic system should be broadened to go beyond the G8. The institutions' voting-share systems, long weighted in favour of Western Europe and the United States, should also be changed to take into account current economic and demographic realities.

### Reforming WTO

WTO decision-making processes have become increasingly slow and cumbersome because of the size, complexity and all encompassing nature of the so-called single undertaking approach employed during negotiations. This approach requires all countries involved in a comprehensive round of multilateral negotiations to subscribe to and implement policies agreed to in their entirety. Reform would not necessarily limit the ability of negotiators to delve into complex and technical negotiations, nor would it imperil the consensus-based nature of WTO rules. Reform should, however, focus on introducing more transparency and formality in the "green room" process by which countries currently reach informal agreements. Granting LDCs and other developing countries more input and influence in the WTO dispute settlement procedure would be an appropriate priority. More effectively recognizing and responding to the needs of LDCs would also be achieved by establishing a formal consultative process in which stakeholders from poor countries, including civil society and trade unions, for example, are involved in discussions.

**Granting LDCs and other developing countries more input and influence in the WTO dispute settlement procedure would be an appropriate priority**

Democratic governance is imperative not only at the national level, but also at the global level. As long as opportunities, voice and representation are not equitably distributed at the global level, LDCs will continue to be constrained in their efforts to overcome their development challenges. The eighth MDG focuses on the need for global cooperation among all nations. Without such cooperation, neither development nor human well-being can secure in any part of the world — rich or poor — and cooperation can only work for all if it reflects a fair system and is based on mutual benefits. Democratic governance at the global level is thus essential for LDCs as they strive to achieve the MDGs within the next 15 years.

# Text glossary

**Access to information:** Refers not only to promoting and protecting rights to information, but equally with promoting and protecting communication (use of information) to voice one's views, participate in democratic processes that take place at all levels (community, national, regional and global) and set priorities for action

**Access to justice:** Refers primarily to an individual's access to courts or guarantee of legal representation. In addition, access to justice is defined in terms of ensuring that legal and judicial outcomes are just and equitable.

**Accountability:** Refers to holding individuals and organizations responsible for their performance as objectively as possible. There are four main forms of accountability, all of which are closely linked and integrated:

- *Financial accountability* is the obligation of anyone handling resources, public office or any other position of trust to report on the intended and actual use of the resources or of the designated office. This includes ensuring transparency in the process and procedures to achieve that obligation;

- *administrative accountability*, which includes critical systems of control internal to the government that complement and ensure the proper functioning of checks and balance supplied by the constitutional government and an engaged citizenry. These include civil service standards and incentives, ethics codes, criminal penalties and administrative review;

- *political accountability*, which fundamentally begins with free and transparent elections and is an effective starting point for oversight. In an electoral democracy, people have a regular, open method for sanctioning or rewarding those who hold positions of public trust. Through periodic elections and control mechanisms, elected and appointed officials are held accountable for their actions while holding public office. Another mechanism to achieve more specific oversight is to have the three political branches (executive, legislative and the judiciary) watch over each other. In addition, separating the institution that raises and spends funds from that which actually executes the spending decision helps ensure that the underlying public interest is served; and

- *social accountability*, which is a demand-driven approach that relies on civic engagement and involves ordinary citizens and groups exacting greater accountability for public actions and outcomes.

**African Peer Review Mechanism**: A NEPAD initiative designed to allow African countries to work together to overcome shortcomings and weaknesses in their governance structures and practices. Countries agreed to establish clear codes, standards and indicators of good governance, and that there should be a method to monitor performance at the national, regional and continental levels. The overall aim is to foster stability; promote peace, security and democracy; and uphold the rule of law. The Mechanism is a voluntary initiative; as of June 2005, twenty-three countries had signed on to the Mechanism, and more are expected to join later

**Alternative vote (AV):** A preferential plurality/majority electoral system used in single-member districts. Voters use numbers to mark their preferences on a paper ballot. A candidate who receives an absolute majority (50 percent plus one) of valid first-preference votes is declared elected. If no candidate achieves an absolute majority of first preferences, the least successful candidates are eliminated and their votes reallocated according to the second preferences of voters who chose them first. The process continues until one candidate has an absolute majority. Voters select candidates, not political parties.

**Blair Commission**: In early 2004, British Prime Minister Tony Blair established the Commission for Africa to identify obstacles to prosperity in Africa and propose solutions to removing them. A total of 17 people were on the commission, of whom nine were from Africa. The commission's report, "Our Common Interest," was published on 11 March 2005; it is addressed to the leaders of the G8 and to the wider international community, as well as to the people of Africa and everywhere.

**Block vote (BV):** A plurality/majority electoral system used in multi-member districts. Electors have as many votes as there are candidates to be elected. The candidates with the highest vote totals win the seats. Usually voters vote for candidates rather than parties and in most systems they may use as many, or as few, of their votes as they wish.

**Borda count:** A candidate-centred preferential electoral system used in either single- or multimember districts. Voters use numbers to mark their preferences on the ballot, and then assign a value to each preference (for example, their first choice gets a "2", their second a "1"). The numbers are added up, and the candidate(s) with the highest total(s) is/are declared elected.

**Capacity:** The skills, knowledge and resources needed to perform a function.

**Capacity development**: The process by which individuals, groups, organizations, institutions and countries develop their abilities, individually and collectively, to perform functions, solve problems and achieve objectives.

**Capacity-building**: Capacity-building builds on a pre-existing capacity base rather than developing capacity of individuals, groups, organizations, institutions and countries. The aim of capacity development and capacity-building is to help governments, organizations and people attain a level of self-sufficiency that enables them to effectively manage their own affairs.

**Civil society:** Civil society refers to the arena of uncoerced collective action around shared interests, purposes and value. In theory, its institutional forms are distinct from those of the State, family and market, though in practice, the boundaries between the State, civil society, family and market are often complex, blurred and negotiated. Civil society commonly embraces a diversity of spaces, actors and institutional forms, varying in their degree of formality, autonomy and power. Civil societies are often populated by organizations such as registered charities, development non-governmental organizations, community groups, women's organizations, faith-based organizations, professional associations, trade unions, self-help groups, social movements, business associations, coalitions and advocacy groups.

**Corporate governance:** The process of supervision and control (of governing) intended to ensure that a company's management acts in accordance with the interests of the shareholders. Governance is thus distinguishable from executive decision-making, with the former being the process by which managers are held accountable for their performance of the latter function.

**Corruption:** The misuse of public power, office or authority for private benefit — through bribery, extortion, influence peddling, nepotism, fraud or embezzlement.

**Country cooperation framework**: A document that outlines the intended nature, focus and financial scope of UNDP's cooperation in a country. The framework identifies key goals and opportunities for UNDP's support to national programmes and priorities that are consistent with the poverty elimination priority and sustainable human development goals endorsed by the Executive Board. It reflects the main elements of the intended strategies and thematic areas without elaborating the details of the programmes.

**Democratic governance:** Democratic governance seeks, in common with good governance, efficient institutions and a predictable economic and political environment that makes economic growth possible, and for public services to function. However, moving beyond economic growth to human development requires political and economic freedom backed by human rights. Democratic governance for human development embeds that most fundamental of democratic principles: that people should rule themselves through the government they choose.

From the human development perspective, good governance is democratic governance. Democratic governance means that: 1) people's human rights and fundamental freedoms are respected, allowing them to live with dignity; 2) people have a say in decisions that affect their lives; 3) people can hold decision makers accountable; 4) inclusive and fair rules, institutions and practices govern social interactions; 5) women are equal partners with men in private and public spheres of life and decision-making; 6) people are free from discrimination based on race, ethnicity, class, gender or any other attribute; 7) the needs of future generations are reflected in current policies; 8) economic and social policies are responsive to people's needs and aspirations. (Economic and social policies aim at eradicating poverty and expanding the choices that all people have in their lives.)

**Democratization:** Refers to the transition from authoritarian or semi-authoritarian systems to democratic political systems. Democratic systems are defined by universal suffrage, regular elections, civil society, the rule of law and an independent judiciary.

**Effectiveness**: Refers to the capacity to realize organizational and/or individual objectives. Effectiveness requires competence; sensitivity and responsiveness to specific, concrete, human concerns; and the ability to articulate these concerns, formulate goals to address them and develop and implement strategies to realize these goals.

**Efficiency**: Refers to processes and institutions that are effective in producing results that meet needs while making the best use of available resources.

**E-governance:** Refers to systems designed to ensure that emerging information and media policies enhance pluralism and public access; facilitate broad-based use of information, communication and technology (ICT) for development; enhance capacities of governments to provide information and public services in a user-friendly and cost-effective manner; and develop ICT solutions that facilitate affordable and user-friendly access to information. E-governance also includes improving capacities to use ICT for networking and information-sharing, enhancing participation in consultative processes and decision-making through the use of ICT and supporting the use of ICT to promote accountability and dialogue among different stakeholders.

**Elections:** Refers to 1) a means for people to choose their representatives — in a parliament, a congress and/or a single executive office such as the presidency; and 2) a means of choosing governments. Elections confer legitimacy on a political system. They are one of the most important ways a citizen can participate in decisions that affect their lives and hold their representatives accountable for results. Elections therefore provide a critical intersection between citizens and the interlinked goals of poverty alleviation, human development and the achievement of the MDGs. The political legitimacy that credible elections confer is essential for robust states and provides a crucial mandate for governments to have the capacity to tackle a myriad of sustainable development challenges.

**Empowerment:** The expansion of people's capacities and choices; the ability to exercise choice based on freedom from hunger, want and deprivation; and the opportunity to participate in, or endorse, decision-making that affects their lives. Empowerment focuses on beneficiaries as the owners of rights and the directors of development, and emphasizes the human person as the centre of the development process (directly, through their advocates and through organizations of civil society). The goal is to give people the power, capacities, capabilities and access necessary to change their own lives, improve their own

communities, and influence their own destinies. People must not be viewed as passive subjects, but must be able to participate in, contribute to and enjoy development.

**Enabling environment**: Conditions surrounding an activity or system that facilitate the fulfilment of the potential of that activity or system. Enabling environment includes the preconditions for sustainable human development, including supportive laws and regulations, adequate resources and skills, broad understanding and acceptance of the differing roles of the State, the private sector and civil society in sustainable human development, a common purpose and trust. The relationships among these conditions and the global environment are also important.

**Evaluation:** A selective exercise that attempts to systematically and objectively assess progress towards and achievement of an outcome. Evaluation is not a one-time event but an exercise involving assessment of differing scope and depth carried out at several points in time in response to evolving needs for evaluative knowledge and learning during the effort to achieve an outcome. All evaluations — even project evaluations that assess relevance, performance and other criteria — need to be linked to outcomes as opposed to only implementation or immediate outputs.

**First past the post (FPTP):** The simplest form of a plurality/majority electoral system. The winning candidate is the one who gains more votes than any other candidate, even if this is not an absolute majority of valid votes. The system uses single-member districts and voters vote for candidates rather than political parties.

**Global governance:** Refers to the institutions, organizations, networks and processes generated by global actors to guide and restrain the behaviour of themselves and others in both national and international domains. These global actors include governments and multilateral or inter-state organizations, private-sector actors that organize and undertake their commercial activities on a global basis, and non-governmental organizations whose membership, values, issues, organization or actions have a transnational or supraterritorial element. Global governance is a broader term than "global government," which suggests a centralized authority capable of creating formal obligations without the explicit consent of affected states and other parties.

**Good governance for sustainable human development**: For development to be sustained in human development terms, the ends and means of good governance are democratized. Democratizing good governance for human development means: 1) that the freedoms of development are ends in themselves, over and beyond their instrumental value and 2) that freedom is the development metric by which people and governments monitor and assess human progress.

**Governance:** Refers to "the exercise of economic, political and administrative authority to manage a country's affairs at all levels." It comprises mechanisms, processes and institutions through which citizens and groups articulate their interests, exercise their legal rights, meet their obligations and mediate their differences. The term "good governance" emerged in the late 1980s and early 1990s primarily in the World Bank, which was concerned about the ways in which governance influenced economic performance. The economic dimension of good governance has variously included public-sector management, organizational accountability, the rule of law, transparency of decision-making and access to information. This idea was further developed by the OECD and EU and integrated into the requirements for development assistance. It was later expanded by UNDP to incorporate a political dimension that includes government legitimacy, government accountability, government competence and the protection of human rights through the rule of law.

**Human capacity:** The knowledge, skills and know-how of individuals acquired through formal and informal training and education.

**Human development:** A process of achieving the necessary capabilities — the range of things that a person can do and be in leading a life. When human development and human rights advance together, they reinforce each other, thus expanding people's capabilities and protecting their fundamental rights and freedoms. United Nations documents emphasize "human development," measured by life expectancy, adult literacy, access to all three levels of education, as well as people's average income, which is a necessary condition of their freedom of choice. In a broader sense the notion of human development incorporates all aspects of individuals' well-being, from their health status to their economic and political freedom. According to the Human Development Report 1996, published by UNDP, "human development is the end — economic growth a means."

**Human rights:** Refers to the idea that all people, men and women alike, have claims to human capabilities and social arrangements that protect them from the worst abuses and deprivations and enable them to enjoy their dignity as human beings.

**Human rights-based approach:** An approach to development that is a conceptual framework for the process of human development that is normatively based on international human rights standards and operationally directed to promoting and protecting human rights. Essentially, a rights-based approach integrates the norms, standards and principles of the international human rights system into the plans, policies and processes of development. The norms and standards are those contained in the wealth of international treaties and declarations. The principles include those of equality and equity, accountability, empowerment and participation.

- *Express linkage to right*: Such approaches begin by expressly defining the objectives of development and aid in terms of particular rights, as legally enforceable entitlements, and create express normative links to international, regional and national human rights instruments.

- *Accountability*: Human rights-based approaches focus on raising levels of accountability in the development process by identifying claim-holders (and their entitlements) and corresponding duty-holders (and their obligations). In this regard, they look both at the positive obligations (to protect, promote and provide) of duty holders, and their negative obligations (to abstain from violations).

- *Empowerment:* Rights-based approaches also give preference to strategies for empowerment, over charitable responses.

- *Participation:* Rights-based approaches require a high degree of participation, including from communities, civil society, minorities, indigenous peoples, women and others. Such participation must be "active, free, and meaningful," which implies that mere formal or "ceremonial" contacts with beneficiaries are not sufficient.

- *Non-discrimination and attention to vulnerable groups*: The human rights imperative of such approaches also means that they must include particular attention to discrimination, equality, equity and to vulnerable groups such as women, minorities, indigenous peoples, prisoners and others. There is, however, no universal checklist of who is most vulnerable in every given context. Rather, rights-based approaches require that such questions be answered locally: Who is vulnerable, here and now? As such, development data must be disaggregated, to the extent possible, by race, religion, ethnicity, language, sex and other categories of human rights concern.

**Informal sector:** Refers to all income-earning production and exchange that takes place outside the formal and state-regulated economy. The characteristics of the urban informal sector are the ease of entry, reliance on indigenous resources, family ownership of enterprises, small-scale operation, labour-intensive and adapted technology, skills acquired outside the formal education system, and unregulated and competitive markets.

**Integrity:** Refers to a key element that completes the notion of accountability and transparency. It is defined as incorruptibility, an unimpaired condition or soundness, and is synonymous to honesty. In terms of public service, integrity requires that holders of public office should not place themselves under financial and other obligation to outside individual or organizations that may influence them in the performance of their official duties. Integrity is not an end in itself. Rather, it is a path leading to the effective delivery of the services and performance of functions, which the public is entitled to receive from those who govern them.

**Institution:** An organization or group of related organizations created to serve a specific purpose.

**Institution-building**: The creation, development and linking of certain functions to accomplish specific tasks within institutions.

**Institutional capacity:** Refers to the institution's potential to successfully perform and apply its skills and resources to accomplish goals and satisfy stakeholders' expectations.

**Justice:** Refers to an ideal of accountability and fairness in the protection and vindication of rights and the prevention and punishment of wrongs. Justice implies regard for the rights of the accused, for the interest of victims and for the well-being of society at large.

**Legislative strengthening:** Refers to developing the capacity of the legislation to operate more efficiently and effectively in carrying out its lawmaking function in terms of law drafting; revising rules or procedures and functions of oversight and representation, including constituency relations; budget negotiations; and accountability of government ministries.

**Legitimacy:** The degree to which a government's procedures for making and enforcing laws are acceptable to the people. A legitimate system is legal, but more importantly, citizens believe in its appropriateness and adhere to its rules. Legitimacy is closely tied to governance: Voluntary compliance with laws and regulations results in greater effectiveness than reliance on coercion and personal loyalties.

**Limited vote:** A candidate-centred electoral system used in multi-member districts in which electors have more than one vote, but fewer votes than there are candidates to be elected. The candidates with the highest vote totals win the seats.

**List proportional representation (List PR):** An electoral system in which each party or grouping presents a list of candidates for a multi-member electoral district, the voters vote for a party, and parties receive seats in proportion to their overall share of the vote. In some (closed list) systems the winning candidates are taken from the lists in order of their position on the lists. If the lists are "open" or "free," voters can influence the order of the candidates by marking individual preferences.

**Local governance:** The process by which sub-national levels of society are empowered to ensure that local people participate in, and benefit from their own governance institutions and development services. It brings policy formulation, service delivery and resource management within the purview of the people.

**Mixed member proportional system (MMP):** A mixed electoral system in which the choices expressed by the voters are used to elect representatives through two different systems — one List PR system and (usually) one plurality/majority system — where the List PR system compensates for the disproportionality in the results from the plurality/majority system.

**Monitoring:** A continuing function that aims primarily to provide the management and main stakeholders of an ongoing intervention with early indication of progress, or lack thereof, in the achievement of results. An ongoing intervention might be a project, programme or other kind of support to an outcome.

**National human rights institutions (NHRIs):** Particular type of institution, falling between civil society and government spheres, with the purported aim of implementing human rights norms domestically — thus serving to inject or implant international human rights principles into national political discourses, state structures and practices. NHRIs are autonomous and independent, but at the same time they could be considered official state bodies because they are funded by public sources and established by law. Fully accredited NHRI are the organizations that adhere to the UN Paris Principles in terms of mandate, independence and the pluralist representation of societal groups in their organization.

**New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD):** Viewed as a vision and strategic framework for Africa's renewal, the NEPAD strategic framework document arises from a mandate given to the five initiating Heads of State (Algeria, Egypt, Nigeria, Senegal, South Africa) by the Organization of African Unity (OAU) to develop an integrated socio-economic development framework for Africa. The 37th Summit of the OAU in July 2001 formally adopted the strategic framework document, and it was ratified again when the African Union was established in 2002. Democracy and good political, economic and corporate governance are among NEPAD's key priorities.

**Non-governmental organizations (NGOs):** As defined by the World Bank, NGOs are "private organizations that pursue activities to relieve suffering, promote the interests of the poor, protect the environment, provide basic social services, or undertake community development." In wider usage, the term NGO can be applied to any non-profit organization that is independent from government. NGOs are typically value-based organizations that depend, in whole or in part, on charitable donations and voluntary service.

**Ombudsman:** An administrative body established to receive and adjudicate upon complaints against public bodies. Such bodies can be local, national or service based.

**Participation:** Rights-based approaches require a high degree of participation, including from communities, civil society, minorities, indigenous peoples, women and others. Such participation must be active, free and meaningful; mere formal or ceremonial contacts with beneficiaries are not sufficient. Rights-based approaches give due attention to issues of accessibility, including to development processes, institutions, information and redress or complaints mechanisms. This also means situating development project mechanisms in proximity to partners and beneficiaries. Such approaches necessarily opt for process-based development methodologies and techniques, rather than externally conceived quick fixes and imported technical models.

**Parallel system:** A mixed electoral system in which the choices expressed by the voters are used to elect representatives through two different systems — one List PR system and (usually) one plurality/majority system — but where no account is taken of the seats allocated under the first system in calculating the results in the second system.

**Party bloc vote (PBV):** A plurality/majority electoral system using multi-member districts in which voters cast a single party-centred vote for a party of choice, and do not choose between candidates. The party with the most votes wins every seat in the electoral district.

**Political parties:** As the central institutions in a democracy, political parties have many functions in democratic systems. Among other things, political parties contest and win elections to gain control of the government institutions in order to implement policies;

they aggregate diverse interests by bringing together people and groups with common values and ideas; they provide structure for political participation and formulate policy options on issues of national importance; and they provide ideas about how society should be governed. Also, political parties identify and train political leaders and act as link between citizens and the government.

**Private sector:** The part of a nation's economy that is not directly controlled by the government. This includes service providers, non-governmental organizations, and for-profit, non-profit, formal and non-formal entities. It can also include the few remaining state-owned enterprises whose sole purpose is commercial activities and that make decisions primarily on commercial basis. Among the most common elements of the private sector are informal sector operators, family businesses, community-based business enterprises, micro-finance businesses, small- and medium-sized enterprises, national and international corporations and the few remaining state corporations whose activities are solely commercial.

**Public administration:** Refers to 1) the aggregate machinery (policies, rules, procedures, systems, organizational structures, personnel, etc.) funded by the state budget and in charge of the management and direction of the affairs of the executive government, and its interaction with other stakeholders in the State, society and external environment; and 2) the management and implementation of the whole set of government activities dealing with the implementation of laws, regulations and decisions of the government and the management related to the provision of public services.

**Public administration reform:** Refers to process changes, often quite comprehensive, in areas such as organizational structures, decentralization, personnel management, public finance, results-based management and regulatory reforms. It can also refer to targeted reforms such as the revision of civil service statutes.

**Public good:** In economics, a public good is a good that is hard or even impossible to produce for private profit, because the market fails to account for its large beneficial externalities. By definition, a public good possesses two properties: 1) it is non-rivalrous meaning that its benefits fail to exhibit consumption scarcity. Once it has been produced, everyone can benefit from it without diminishing other's enjoyment; 2) it is non-excludable meaning that once it has been created, it is very difficult to impossible to prevent access to the good.

The economic concept of public goods should not be confused with the expression "the public good," which is usually an application of a collective ethical notion of "the good" in political decision-making.

**Public sector**: The part of the economy that is not privately owned, either because it is owned by the State or because it is subject to common ownership. This generally includes the national government, local authorities, national industries and public corporations.

**Representation:** In politics, representation describes how citizens of a country are empowered in the government. Representation usually refers to representative democracies, where elected representatives speak for their constituents in the parliament. Generally, only citizens are granted representation in the government in the form of voting rights; however, some democracies have extended this right further.

**Right to development:** The right to participate in, contribute to and enjoy economic, social, cultural and political development

**Rule of law:** Refers to a principle of governance in which all persons, institutions and entities, public and private, including the State itself, are accountable to laws that are publicly promulgated, equally enforced and independently adjudicated, and which are consistent with international human rights norms and standards. It requires, as well,

measures to ensure adherence to the principles of supremacy of law, equality before the law, accountability to the law, fairness in the application of the law, separation of powers, participation in decision-making, legal certainty, avoidance of arbitrariness and procedural and legal transparency.

**Single non-transferable vote (SNTV):** An electoral system in which voters cast a single vote in a multi-member district. The candidates with the highest vote totals are declared elected. Voters vote for candidates rather than political parties.

**Single transferable vote (STV):** A preferential electoral system in which the voter has one vote in a multi-member district and the candidates that surpass a specified quota of first-preference votes are immediately elected. In successive counts, votes are redistributed from least successful candidates, who are eliminated, and votes surplus to the quota are redistributed from successful candidates, until sufficient candidates are declared elected. Voters normally vote for candidates rather than political parties, although a party-list option is possible.

**Small and medium enterprise (SME):** Operational definitions of this are generally based on the number of persons employed or the amount of fixed capital and vary from country to country. SMEs can be considered as having, say, between five to two hundred employees and are found in the formal sector (i.e., they are formally registered as a business organization). SMEs can be distinguished from *micro enterprises*, which employ a very small number of people (often only one to five), experience severe constraints regarding access to resources, and typically make up part of the informal sector, and from *large enterprises*, which have many employees and greater capital.

**Social capital**: Refers to features of social organization — such as networks and values, including tolerance, inclusion, reciprocity, participation and trust — that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit.

**State:** The set of political institutions whose specific concern is with the social and political organization and management, in the name of the common interest, within a determined territory.

**Sustainable development:** Development within sustainable processes and institutions which meets certain criteria: It does not exhaust resources for the future generations; the capacity of people and institutions is permanently enhanced; and responsibilities and benefits are broadly shared.

**Sustainable human development**: Refers to the concept of seeking to expand choices for all people — women, men and children, current and future generations — while protecting the natural systems on which all life depends. Moving away from a narrow, economy-centred approach to development, sustainable human development places people at the core and views humans as both a means and an end of development. Thus sustainable human development aims to eliminate poverty, promote human dignity and rights, and provide equitable opportunities for all through good governance, thereby promoting the realization of all human rights — economic, social, cultural, civil and political.

**Transparency:** Refers to all means of facilitating citizens' access to information and their understanding of decision-making mechanisms. Public-sector transparency begins with the clear application of standards and access to information.

**Transitional justice:** Refers to the full range of processes and mechanisms associated with a society's attempts to come to terms with a legacy of large-scale past abuses to ensure accountability, serve justice and achieve reconciliation. These attempts may include both judicial and non-judicial mechanisms, with differing levels of international involvement (or none at all) and individual prosecutions, reparations, truth commissions, institutional reform, vetting and dismissals, or a combination thereof.

**Two-round system (TRS):** A plurality/majority electoral system in which a second election is held if no candidate or party achieves a given level of votes, most commonly an absolute majority (50 percent plus one), in the first election round. A two-round system may take a majority-plurality form — in which more than two candidates contest the second round and the one with the highest number of votes in the second round is elected, regardless of whether they have won an absolute majority — or a majority run-off form, in which only the top two candidates in the first round contest the second round.

**Voice:** Refers to the ability of people to be heard in public policy-making, underpinned by freedom of speech and thought, freedom of information, free and independent media and open public debate.

# Bibliography

Access to Justice Revisited. 2005. International Conference on Peace, Justice, and Reconciliation in the Asia-Pacific Region. Brisbane, Australia: University of Queensland.

Abdellatic, Adel A. "Good Governance and Its Relationship to Democracy and Economic Development." [GF3/WS/IV-3/S1]. 2003. Seoul, Rep. of Korea.

Acharya, Meena and Art Wright. 2000. "An Evaluation of the Impact of the United Nations on Capacity Building for Poverty Eradication in Nepal 1985-2000." New York, USA: UNDESA (United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs).

ADB (Asian Development Bank). Review of the Governance Cooperation Fund. ADB.

———. 2001. "Women in Bangladesh." Country Briefing Paper. Dhaka, Bangladesh: ADB (Asian Development Bank).

———. 2002a. "Annual Report 2002. Special Theme: Rehabilitation and Reconstruction: ADB's Role in Afghanistan and the Region."

———. 2002b. "Country Strategy and Programme 2002-2004: The Republic of Maldives."

ADB (Asian Development Bank), and OECD (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development). 2004. "Controlling Corruption in Asia and the Pacific." Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia: OECD, ADB.

ADB (Asian Development Bank), UNDP (United Nations Development Programme), World Bank and United Nations Assistance Mission to Afghanistan. 2004. "Securing Afghanistan Future: Accomplishment and the Strategic Path Forward. A Government – International Agency Report."

Adejumobi, Said. 2001. "Citizenship, Rights, and the Problem of Conflict and Civil Wars in Africa." *Human Rights Quarterly* 23(1):148-170.

African Statement Initiative. 2005. Bamako Declaration of the African Statement Initiative, June 8, 2005.

Ahmad, Mzaffer, Ahmed Farid, Shamaila Mahbub, Muhammad A. Amin and Manzoor Hasan. 2005. "National Integrity Systems Country Study Report: Bangladesh 2003." Transparency International.

AICC (African Institute of Corporate Citizenship). "Corporate Citizenship." Pretoria, South Africa: AICC. Online: www.aiccafrica.com.

———. 2001. "Socially Responsible Investment in South Africa." Pretoria, South Africa: AICC.

———. 2004. "Business and Economic Development: Pharmaceutical Sector Case Studies." Pretoria, South Africa: AICC

Ajawin, Yoanes and Alex de Waal. Ajawin, Yoanes and Alex de Waal, eds. 2002. *When Peace Comes: Civil Society and Development in Sudan*. Lawrenceville, USA: Red Sea Press.

Akindele, R. A. Akindele, R. A., ed. 2003. *Civil Society, Good Governance, and the Challenge of Regional Security in West Africa*. Lagos, Nigeria: African Strategic and Peace Research Group, Vantage.

Alagappa, Muthiah. 2004. *Civil Society and Political Change in Asia: Expanding and Contracting Democratic Space*. Palo Alto, USA: Stanford University Press.

Alesina, Alberto, Arnaud Devleeschauwer, William Easterly, Sergio Kurlat and Romain Wacziarg. 2003. "Fractionalization." *Journal of Economic Growth* (8):155-194.

Alexander, Susan. 2005. "The Role of the Media in Attaining the MDGs." *Development* 48(1):129-131.

Allain, Jean and Andreas O'Shea. 2002. "African Disunity: Comparing Human Rights Law and Practice of north and South African States." *Human Rights Quarterly* 24:86-125.

Alsop, Ruth and Samantha Forusz. 2002. "Community User Groups: Vehicles for Collective Action — Or Personal Gain?" *The World Bank PREM Notes* (72).

Alvazzi de Frate, Anna. 1998. "Victims of Crime in the Developing World." [UNICRI Publication # 57]. Rome, Italy: UNICRI (United Nations Interregional Crime and Justice Research Institute).

Amnesty International. 2001. "Universal Jurisdiction: The Duty of States to Enact and Implement Legislation." London, UK: Amnesty International.

———. 2004. International Criminal Court: The Failure of States to Enact Effective Implementing Legislation. London, UK, Amnesty International.

Aoláin, Fionnuala Ní and Colm Campbell. 2005. "The Paradox of Transition in Conflicted Democracies." *Human Rights Quarterly* (27):172-213.

Aron, Janine. 2002. "Building Institutions in Post-Conflict African Economies." [Discussion paper No. 2002/124]. UNU (United Nations University), WIDER (World Institute for Development Economics Research.

ASEAN (Association of Southeast Asian Nations). 2004. "Annual Report 2004-2005." Jakarta, Indonesia: ASEAN.

———. 2005. ASEAN: "Narrowing the Development Gap." Jakarta, Indonesia: ASEAN.

Asofou So'o, Le'apai L., Ruta-Fita Sinclair, Unasa L. F. Va'a and Sonny Lameta. 2004. "National Integrity Systems Country Study Report: Samoa 2004." Transparency International.

Atallah, Sami. 2001. "E-Government: Considerations for Arab States." UNDP (United Nations Development Programme) Sub-regional Resource Facility.

Atsanavong, Lonkham, Ranjith Perera and Thammarath Koottatep. 2005. "Decentralised Sanitation Systems: Reaching an Under-Served Urban Community." *Juth Pakai: Sharing Information to Stimulate Development* (4):6-17.

Ayyagari, Meghana, Thorsten Beck and Asli Demirguc-Kunt. 2003. "Small and Medium Enterprises across the Globe: A New Database." World Bank.

Baazara, Nyangabyaki. 2000. *Contemporary Civil Society and the Democratisation Process in Uganda: A Preliminary Exploration*. Kampala, Uganda: Centre for Basic Research.

Bageya, Waiswa. 2003. "Justice Law and Order Sector: Sector PEAP Revision Strategy Paper." Uganda.

Baldwin, Peter. 2005. "Beyond Weak and Strong: Rethinking the State in Comparative Policy History." *The Journal of Policy History* 17(1):12-33.

Ball, Nicole. 2002. "Enhancing Security Sector Governance: A Conceptual Framework for UNDP." New York, USA, UNDP (United Nations Development Programme).

Ball, Nicole, J., 'Kayode Fayemi, Funmi Olonisakin and Rocklyn Williams. Ball, Nicole and J. 'Kayode Fayemi, eds. 2004. *Security Sector Governance in Africa: A Handbook*. London, UK.

Balogun, M. J. 2003. "Performance Management and Agency Governance for African Development: The Search for Common Cause on Excellence in the Public Service." Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: UN ECA (United Nations Economic Commission for Africa).

Baran, Kanna, and UNDP (United Nations Development Programme). 2000. "Laos: Building Local Models for a National Civil Society." In Anirudh Krishna, ed. *Changing Policy and Practice from Below: Community Experiences in Poverty Reduction — An Examination of Nine Case-Studies.* New York, USA: UNDP.

Barman, Dalem, Golam Rahman and Tasneem Siddiqui. "Democracy Report for Bangladesh." Country Reports for the International IDEA State of Democracy Project. International IDEA: Stockholm, Sweden.

Barnes, Samuel H. 2001. "The Contribution of Democracy to Rebuilding Postconflict Societies." *The American Journal of International Law* 95:86-101.

Barsky, Jennifer. 2004. "UNDP and the Private Sector: Building Partnerships for Development." New York, USA: UNDP (United Nations Development Programme).

Barton, Carol, Martin Khor, Sunita Narain and Victoria Tauli-Corpuz. 2005. "Civil Society Perspectives on the Millennium Development Goals." New York, USA: United Nations.

Bell, Christine and Johanna Keenan. 2004. "Human Rights Nongovernmental Organizations and the Problems of Transition." *Human Rights Quarterly* 26:330-374.

Bhatnagar, Subhash. 2003. "Administrative Corruption: How Does E-Government Help?" Ahmedabad, India: Indian Institute of Management.

Biaou, Rogatien. 2005. "Communication du Bénin a l'occasion du Forum Régional sur le theme: "Réinventer la gouvernance en Afrique." Presentation from the Ministers of Foreign Affairs and African Integration at the Regional Forum on "Reinventing Government in Africa: Repositioning the Public Sector for the Challenges Faced by Less Advanced Countries in Post-Armed Conflict Situations," Johannesburg, South Africa.

Bildin, Pinar and Adam D. Morton. 2004. "From 'Rogue' to 'Failed' States? The Fallacy of Short-termism." *Politics* 24(3):169-180.

Binger, Al. 2004. "Report of the Expert Group Meeting on Resource Mobilization for Poverty Eradication in the Least Developed Countries." [CDP2004/PLEN/4]. New York, USA: Committee for Development Policy (CDP).

Bissio, Roberto. 2003. "Civil Society and the MDGs." *Development Policy Journal* 3:151-160.

Boafo, S.T. Kwame. 2000. "Promoting Community Media in Africa." Paris, France: UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization).

Bovaird, Tony and Elke Loffler. 2003. "Evaluating the Quality of Public Governance: Indicators, Models and Methodologies." *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 69:313-328.

Boyle, Elizabeth H. 2000. "Is Law the Rule? Using Political Frames to Explain Cross National Variation." *Social Forces* 79(2):385-418.

Brato, M. and Aldfelder, P. 1999. "The Effects of Civic Education on Political Culture: Evidence from Zambia." *World Development* 27 (5).

Breman, Henk and Siegfried Kofi Debrah. 2003. "Improving African Food Security." *SAIS Review* 23(1):153-170.

Brinkerhoff, Derick W. 1999. "State – Civil Society Networks for Policy Implementation in Developing Countries." *Policy Studies Review* 16(1):123-147.

Brown, Mark Malloch. 2005. "Democratic Governance: Linking the Security and Development Agenda." New York, USA: United Nations.

Bujra, Abdalla and Sipho Buthelezi. 2002. *Leadership, Civil Society and Democratisation in Africa: Case Studies from Southern Africa*. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: Development Policy Management Forum.

Burma Center Netherlands, Transitional Institute. 1999. *Strengthening Civil Society in Burma: Possibilities and Dilemmas for International NGOs*. Chiang Mai, Thailand: Silkworm Books.

Buscaglia, Edgardo. 2001. "Justice and the Poor: Formal vs. Informal Dispute Resolution Mechanisms: A Governance-Based Approach." St. Petersburg, Russia: World Bank, Government of Russia.

Cain, Tess Newton and Anita Jowitt. 2005. "National Integrity Systems Country Study Report: Vanuatu 2004." Transparency International.

Callahan, William A. 1999. *Pollwatching, Elections, and Civil Society in Southeast Asia*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.

Carapico, Sheila. 1998. *Civil Society in Yemen: The Political Economy of Activism in Modern Arabia*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Carothers, Thomas. 2002. "The End of the Transition Paradigm." *Journal of Democracy* 13(1):5-21.

———. 2003. "Promoting the Rule of Law Abroad: The Problem of Knowledge." [Rule of Law Series No. 34]. Washington, USA: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Centre Djoliba and Memorial Modibo Keita. 2002. *Bâtissons la Mémoire du Mali Démocratique: 26 Mars 1991 – 26 Mars 2001: Xe Anniversaire*. Bamako, Mali: Centre Djoliba, Memorial Modibo Keita.

Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue. 2004. "February 2004 Report: Assistance to Justice and the Rule of Law in Afghanistan — A Strategic Analysis." London, UK.

Chanda, Alfred. 2003. "National Integrity Systems Country Study Report: Zambia 2003." Transparency International.

Cheema, G. Shabir. 2005. *Building Democratic Institutions: Governance Reform in Developing Countries*. Bloomfield, USA: Kumarian Press.

Chege, Michael. 2002. "Sierra Leone: The State that Came Back from the Dead." *The Washington Quarterly* 25(3):147-160.

Chesterman, Simon. 2005. "State-Building and Human Development." Human Development Report Occasional Paper. New York, USA: UNDP (United Nations Development Programme).

Chichereau, Philippe. 2004. "Aid Coordination, Planning and Management in Sudan: Ownership Through Partnership." Needs Assessment Report and Recommendations.

Chirwa, Wiseman, Nandini Patel and Fidelis Kanyongolo. "Democracy Report for Malawi." Stockholm, Sweden: International IDEA (Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance).

Clapham, Christopher. 2002. "The Challenge to the State in Globalized World." *Development and Change* 33(5):775-795.

Clark, David H. and Timothy Nordstrom. 2005. "Democratic Variants and Democratic Variance: How Democratic Constraints Shape Interstate Conflict." *The Journal of Politics* 67(1):250-270.

Clarke, John. 2005. "Afghanistan Case Study: SG's Report to ECOSOC on Transitions." Mimeo.

COHRE (Centre on Housing Rights and Evictions). 2005. "UNDP Discussion Note on Land Rights: Summary." Mimeo.

Colburn, Marta. 2002. *The Republic of Yemen: Development Challenges in the 21st Century*. London, UK: Stacey International.

Collège de Contrôle et de Surveillance des Ressources Pétrolières, "Report of Mission to Sites of Project Finance by Old Revenues," online: http://ccsrp-tchad.org/site/index2.cfm and http://www.worldbank.org/afr/ccproj

Commission on Human Security. 2003. "Human Security Now: Protecting and Empowering People." New York, USA.

Commission on Human Rights. 2005. "Civil and Political Rights: Including the Question of Independence of the Judiciary, Administration of Justice, Impunity." [E/CN.4/2004/60/Add.1]. New York, USA: United Nations.

Conley, Marshall and Daniel Livermore. 1996. "Human Rights, Development and Democracy: The Dilemmas of Linking Theory and Practice." *Canadian Journal of Development Studies*: 0 (0):19-36.

Constitutional Commission of Afghanistan. 2005. "The Constitutions-Making Process in Afghanistan."

Corner, Lorraine. 2005. Gender-sensitive and Pro-poor Indicators of Good Governance. Oslo, Norway: Oslo Governance Centre, UNDP (United Nations Development Programme).

Cowen, Michael and Liisa Laakso. Cowen, Michael and Liisa Laakso, eds. 2002. *Multi-party Elections in Africa*. New York, USA: Palgrave.

Cramer, Christopher and Jonathan Goodhand. 2002. "Try Again, Fail Again, Fail Better? War, the State, and the 'Post-Conflict' Challenge in Afghanistan." *Development and Change* 33(5):885-909.

Crook, Richard C. 2001. "Strengthening Democratic Governance in Conflict Torn Societies: Civil Organisations, Democratic Effectiveness and Political Conflict." [IDS Working Paper 129]. Brighton, UK: IDS (Institute of Development Studies).

Dahlerup, Drude. 2002. "Quotas — A Jump to Equality? The Need for International Comparisons of the Use of Electoral Quotas to Obtain Equal Political Citizenship for Women." Jakarta, Indonesia; Stockholm, Sweden: International IDEA.

———-. 2003. "Comparative Studies of Electoral Gender Quotas." Lima, Peru; Stockholm, Sweden: International IDEA,

Daniel, John, Roger Southall and Morris Szeftel. Daniel, John, Roger Southall and Morris Szeftel, eds. 1999. *Voting for Democracy: Watershed Elections in Contemporary Anglophone Africa*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.

Darrow, Mac and Amparo Tomas. 2005. "Power, Capture, and Conflict: A Call for Human Rights Accountability in Development Cooperation." *Human Rights Quarterly* 27:471-538.

Davis, David R. and Terrence Chapman. 2003. "Conflict and Development: Assessing the Impact Violent Conflict on Human Development 1980-1999." Paper prepared for presentation at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association. Chicago, USA.

Desai, Meghnad. 2000. "Poverty and Governance." New York, USA: UNDP Bureau for Policy Development.

DFID (Department for International Development). 2002. "Safety, Security, and Accessible Justice: Putting Policy into Practice." London, UK.

Dhungel, Dwarika N. 2002. *Governance Situation in Nepal*. Kathmandu, Nepal: IIDS (Institute for Integrated Development Studies).

Dhungel, Dwarika Nath and Achyut B. Rajbhandary. 1998. *Introducing Good Governance in the Public Administration of Nepal*. Lalitpur, Nepal: CSDG (Centre for Studies on Democracy and Good Governance).

Diamond, Larry. 1999a. "Fostering Institutions to Contain Corruption. How Can Institutions of Accountability Be Developed to Control Endemic Corruption?" *The World Bank PREM Notes* (No. 24).

———. 1999b. "Civil Society." In *Developing Democracy: Toward Consolidation*. Baltimore, USA: John Hopkins University Press.

Diamond, Larry and Leonardo Morlino. 2004. "The Quality of Democracy: An Overview." *Journal of Democracy* 15(4):20-31.

Dicklitch, Susan and Doreen Lwanga. 2003. "The Politics of Being Non-Political: Human Rights Organizations and the Creation of a Positive Human Rights Culture in Uganda." *Human Rights Quarterly* 25:482-509.

Doherty, Ivan. 2001. "Democracy Out of Balance: Civil Society Can't Replace Political Parties." *Policy Review*.

Donnelly, Jack. 2005. "Human Rights, Democracy, and Development." *Human Rights Quarterly* 21(3):608-632.

Doornbos, Martin. 2002. "State Collapse and Fresh Starts: Some Critical Reflections." *Development and Change* 33(5):797-815.

Dorff, Robert H. 2005. "Failed States After 9/11: What Did We Know and What Have We Learned?" *International Studies Perspectives* (6):20-34.

Dung, Luu Tien. 2003. "Judicial Independence in Transitional Countries." Oslo, Norway: Oslo Governance Centre, UNDP (United Nations Development Program).

Dunn, John. 2005. *Setting the People Free: The Story of Democracy*. London, UK: Atlantic Books.

Dyer, Kate and Chris Pain. 2004. "Civil Society Budget Monitoring for National Accountability: Workshop Report." Lilongwe, Malawi: OXFAM.

Dyg, Pernille M. and Saleumsy Phithayaphone. 2005. "Home Gardens in the Lao PDR: Linkages between Agricultural Biodiversity and Food." *Juth Pakai: Sharing Information to Stimulate Development* (4):18-26.

Ebrahim, Hassen. 2002. *Constitution-Making in Southern Africa: Challenges for the New Millennium*. Boston, USA: John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.

ECDPM (European Centre for Development Policy Management). 2005. "Study on Capacity, Change and Performance: Interim Report." Mimeo.

Eichenberger, Reiner and Bruno S. Frey. 2002. "Democratic Governance for a Globalized World." *Kyklos* 55(2):265-288.

Ellis, Andrew and Alistair Legge. 2004. "Political Culture, Representation and Electoral Systems in the Pacific." Port Vila, Vanuatu: International IDEA, PIANZEA (Pacific Islands, Australia and New Zealand Election Administrators' Network).

Ellis, Andrew. 2004. "Enhancing Women's Participation in Electoral Processes in Post-Conflict Countries: Background Paper." [EGM/ELEC/2004/BP.2]. New York, USA: UN OSAGI (United Nations Office of the Special Adviser on Gender Issues and Advancement of Women).

Erixon, Fredrik. 2005. "Aid and Development: Will It Work This Time?" London, UK: International Policy Network.

Eschenbacher, Jens-Hagen. 2005. "Internal Displacement: Global Overview of Trends and Developments in 2004." Geneva, Switzerland: Global IDP Project, Norwegian Refugee Council.

Eurodad/WIDER Development Conference on Debt Relief. 2001. "Debt Reduction for Poverty Eradication in the Least Developed Countries: Analysis and Recommendations on LDC Debt." Brussels, Belgium.

Ezekiel, Zachariah. 2003. "Beyond Bylines: Engaging the News Media in Urban Governance." [Policy Brief No. 16]. Ottawa, Canada: Institute on Governance.

Faruque, Omar, Atiur Rahman and Abu Yusuf. 2005. "Small-Scale Water Resources Development Sector Project (SWRDSP)." Unpublished document.

Fatton, Robert. 1999. "The Impairments of Democratization: Haiti in Comparative Perspective." *Comparative Politics* 31(2):209-229.

Feuer, Cary. 2005. "Perception of Corruption in Foreign Aid Projects." *Juth Pakai: Sharing Information to Stimulate Development* (4):38-49.

Finn, John E. 2004. "The Rule of Law and Judicial Independence in Newly Democratic Regimes." *The Good Society* 13(3):12-16.

Fisher, Dana R. and Jessica F. Green. 2004. "Understanding Disenfranchisement: Civil Society and Developing Countries' Influence and Participation in Global Governance for Sustainable Development." *Global Environmental Politics* 4(3):65-81.

Fleschenberg, Andrea. 2005. "Dynasties and Political Leaders in Asia. Engendering Electoral Politics — Quota Regulations as a Means of Increasing Female Political Representation?" [Project Discussion Paper 10/2005].

Fletcher, Christine. 2005. "Local Democracy: Electoral Systems and Representation in Asia and the Pacific — A Background Note." Kathmandu, Nepal: UNDP (United Nations Development Programme).

Forrest, Joshua B. 2003. *Lineages of State Fragility: Rural Civil Society in Guinea-Bissau*. Athens, USA: Ohio University Press.

Foster, Mick and Sadie Mackintosh-Walker. 2001. "Sector Wide Programme and Poverty Reduction." [ODI Working Paper No. 157]. London, UK: Oversees Development Institute.

Fox, Jonathan. 2000. "Civil Society and Political Accountability: Propositions for Discussion." South Bend, USA: University of Notre Dame.

Francis, Paul and Robert James. 2003. "Balancing Rural Poverty Reduction and Citizen Participation: The Contradictions of Uganda's Decentralisation Program." *World Development* 31(2):325-337.

Frankl, Emma. 2004. "Quota as Empowerment: The Use of Reserved Seats in Union Parishad as an Instrument for Women's Political Empowerment in Bangladesh." [Working Paper Series 2004: 3]. 2004. Stockholm, Sweden: University of Stockholm.

Fukuyama, Francis. 2004. "The Imperative of State-Building." *Journal of Democracy* 15(2):17-31.

———. 2005. “Building Democracy After Conflict: ‘Stateness’ First.” *Journal of Democracy* 16(1):84-88.

Fung, Archon and Erik Olin Wright. 2003. *Deepening Democracy: Institutional Innovations in Empowered Participatory Governance*. [The real utopias project; v. 4]. London, UK; New York, USA: Verso.

Gargarella, Roberto. 2002. “Too Far Removed from the People. Access to Justice for the Poor: The Case of Latin America.” Oslo, Norway: Oslo Governance Centre, UNDP (United Nations Development Programme).

Garon, Lise. 2003. *Dangerous Alliances: Civil Society, the Media, and Democratic Transition in North Africa*. London, UK; New York, USA: Zed Books.

Gary, Ian and Nikki Reisch. 2005. “Chad’s Oil: Miracle or Mirage? Following the Money in Africa’s Newest Petro State.“ Washington, USA: Catholic Relief Services and Bank Information Center.

Gerring, John, Strom C. Thacker and Carola Moreno. 2005. “A Centripetal Theory of Democratic Governance: A Global Inquiry.” Paper submitted to *American Science Review*.

Ghai, Yash. 2001. “Human Rights and Social Development: Toward Democratisation and Social Justice.” [Governance and Human Rights Programme Paper Number 5]. 2001. Geneva, Switzerland: UNRISD (United Nations Research Institute for Social Development).

———. 2002. “A Journey around Constitutions: Reflecting on Contemporary Constitutions.” Stockholm, Sweden: International IDEA.

Ghana Center for Democratic Development. 2004. “Strengthening Capacities to Combat Corruption in Tanzania; Final Report.” Accra, Ghana: Ghana Centre for Democratic Development.

Gillespie, Stuart, Lawrence Haddad and Robin Jackson. 2001. “HIV/AIDS Food and Nutrition Security: Impacts and Actions.” IFPRI (International Food Policy Research Institute), WFP (World Food Programme),

Glasius, Marlies, David Lewis and Hakan Seckinelgin. 2004. *Exploring Civil Society: Political and Cultural Contexts*. London, UK; New York, USA: Routledge.

Gloppen, Siri, Lise Rakner and Arne Tostensen. 2003. “Responsiveness to the Concerns of the Poor and Accountability to the Commitment to Poverty Reduction.” Bergen, Norway: Christian Michelsen Institute.

Goetz, Anne Marie and John Gaventa. 2001. “Bringing Citizen Voice and Client Focus into Service Delivery.” Working Paper 138. Brighton, UK: Institute of Development Studies.

Goldstone, Jack and Jay Ulfelder. 2004. “How to Construct Stable Democracies.” *The Washington Quarterly* 28(1):9-20.

Gole, Tadesse Woldemariam. 2002. “Conservation and Use of Coffee Genetic Resources in Ethiopia: Challenges and Opportunities in the Context of Current Global Situations.” PowerPoint presentation.

Golub, Stephen. 2003. “Beyond the Rule of Law Orthodoxy: The legal Empowerment Alternative.” [Rule of Law Series, No. 41]. Washington, USA: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Goodson, Larry. 2005. “Bullets. Ballots and Poppies in Afghanistan.” *Journal of Democracy* 16(1):24-38.

Goodson, Larry P. 2005. "Afghanistan in 2004: Electoral Progress and an Opium Boom." *Asian Survey* 45(1):88-97.

Gracien Jean, J. A. Waldemar Urquiza and Félix Ulloa. 2002. *Sociétés Civiles en Mutation*. Port-au-Prince, Haiti: Centre International de Politologie Appliquée.

Graduate Institute for International Studies. 2005. "Small Arms Survey 2005: Weapons at War." Geneva, Switzerland: Oxford University Press.

Gready, Paul. Gready, Paul, ed. 2004. *Fighting for Human Rights*. London, UK; New York, USA: Routledge.

Grimmett, Richard F. 2004. "Conventional Arms Transfer to Developing Nations, 1996-2003." [CRS Report for Congress RL32547]. Washington, USA: Congressional Research Service, The Library of Congress.

Gueye, Maître Mame Adama. 2001. "National Integrity Systems Country Study Report: Senegal 2001." Transparency International.

Gyimah-Boadi, E. 1996. "Civil Society in Africa." *Journal of Democracy* 7(2):118-132.

Haggard, Stephan and Robert R. Kaufman. Haggard, Stephan and Robert R. Kaufman, eds. 1992. *The Politics of Economic Adjustment: International Constraints, Distributive Conflicts, and the State*. Princeton, USA: Princeton University Press.

Hamann, Ralph and Paul Kapelus. 2004. "Corporate Social Responsibility in Mining Southern Africa: Fair Accountability or Just Greenwash?" *Development* 47(3):85-92.

Hamm, Brigitte I. 2001. "A Human Rights Approach to Development." *Human Rights Quarterly* 23:1005-1031.

Hammergren, Linn. 1998. "Donor-Supported Reforms of Criminal Justice Systems." Washington, USA: World Bank.

Harcourt, Wendy. 2005. "The Millennium Development Goals: A Missed Opportunity?" *Development* 48(1):1-4.

Hart, Vivien. 2003. "Democratic Constitution Making." Special Report 107. Washington, USA: United States Institute of Peace.

Haynes, Jeffrey. 1997. *Democracy and Civil Society in the Third World: Politics and New Political Movements*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Held, David. 2005. "Globalisation, International Law and Human Rights." London, UK: Centre for the Study of Global Governance.

Herzberg, Benjamin and Andrew Wright. 2005. "Competitive Partnerships: Building and Maintaining Public and Private Dialogue to Improve the Investment Climate." [WPS3683]. Washington, USA: World Bank.

Heyns, Christof and Frans Vilijoen. 2001. "The Impact of the United Nations Human Rights Treaties on the Domestic Level." *Human Rights Quarterly* (23):483-535.

Holloway, Richard. 1998. *Supporting Citizens' Initiatives: Bangladesh's NGOs and Society*. London, UK: Intermediate Technology Publications.

Howland, Todd. 2004. "UN Human Rights Field Presence as Proactive Instrument of Peace and Social Change: Lessons from Angola." *Human Rights Quarterly* 26:1-28.

Htun, Mala. 2004. "Is Gender Like Ethnicity? The Political Representation of Identity Groups." *Perspectives in Politics* 2(3):439-458.

Hudock, Ann. 2003. "Hearing Voices of the Poor: Encouraging Good Governance and Poverty Reduction through Media Sector Support." Washington, USA: WLID (World Learning for International Development.

Huffer, Elise. 2005. "Governance, Corruption, and the Ethics in the Pacific." *The Contemporary Pacific* 17(1):118-140.

Huizer, G. 1999. "Peasant Mobilization for Land Reform: Historical Considerations and Theoretical Considerations." [UNRISD Monograph 6]. Rome Italy: Popular Coalition to Eradicate Hunger, UNRISD (United Nations Research Institute for Social Development).

Humphreys, Macartan and Ashutosh Varshney. 2004. "Violent Conflict and the Millennium Development Goals: Diagnosis and Recommendations." Mimeo.

Huntington, Samuel P. 1991. *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century*. Norman, U.S.A: University of Oklahoma Press.

Huq, Saleemul, Atiq Rahma and Mama Konate. 2003. "Mainstreaming Adaptation to Climate Change in Least Developed Countries (LDCS)." London, UK: IIED (International Institute for Environment and Development), BCAS (Bangladesh Centre for Advance Studies), ENDA (Environmental Development in the Third World.

Karen Hussmann and Marie-Ange Bunga, *"Anti-Corruption Case Study on DRC,"* UNDP, 2005.

IADB (Inter-American Development Bank). 2004. "Haiti: Bank's Transition Strategy 2005-2006." Washington, USA: IADB.

IATT (UNAIDS Inter-agency Task Team on Education and HIV/AIDS). 2004. "The Role of Education in the Protection, Care and Support of Orphans and Vulnerable Children Living in a World with HIV and AIDS." Geneva, Switzerland: UNAIDS.

Ibhawoh, Bonny. 2000. "Between Culture and Constitutions: Evaluating the Cultural Legitimacy of Human Rights in the Africa State." *Human Rights Quarterly* 22:838-860.

ICHRP (International Council on Human Rights Policy). 2005. "National Human Rights Institutions: Impact Assessment Indicators." Geneva, Switzerland: ICHRP.

IDEASS (Innovation for Development and South-South Cooperation). 2004. "Participatory Budgeting." Brazil.

IFAD (International Fund for Agricultural Development). 2001. "Rural Poverty Report 2001: The Challenge of Ending Rural Poverty." New York, USA: IFAD.

Igoe, Jim and Tim Kelsall. Igoe, Jim and Tim Kelsall, eds. 2005. *Between a Rock and a Hard Place: African NGOs, Donors, and the State*. Durham, USA: Carolina Academic Press.

ILO (International Labour Organization). 1998. "Job Creation in Small and Medium Sized Enterprises: Guide to ILO Recommendation N. 189." Geneva, Switzerland: ILO.

———. 2003. "Decent Employment through Small Enterprises: A Progress Report on SEED Activities." Geneva, Switzerland: ILO.

———. 2004. "A Fair Globalization: Creating Opportunities for All." Geneva, Switzerland: ILO.

IMF (International Monetary Fund). 2003. *World Economic Outlook: Growth and Institutions*. Washington, USA: IMF.

Institut Panos Afrique de l' Ouest. 2004. *Stratégies de Communication de la société civile en Afrique de l' Ouest: Étude de Bonnes Practiques*. Dakar, Senegal: Institut Panos Afrique de l' Ouest.

International Bar Association. 2003. "Angola: Promoting Justice Post Conflict." London, UK: International Bar Association.

International Budget Project. 2005a. "CSOs Examine Chad-Cameroon Pipeline Project and Chad Budget Process." Newsletter(No. 26).

International Council on Human Rights Policy. 2002. "Local Rule: Decentralisation and Human Rights." Versoix, Switzerland.

International IDEA (Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance). 1997. "Consolidating Democracy in Nepal." Capacity-Building Series 2/97.

———. 1998. "La Démocratie au Burkina Faso." Stockholm, Sweden: International IDEA. Capacity-Building Series 4.

———. 2003. *The Implementation of Quotas: Asian Experiences*. Stockholm, Sweden: International IDEA.

———. 2004. Ballington, Julie, ed. *The Implementation of Quotas: African Experiences*. Stockholm, Sweden: International IDEA.

Isima, Jeffrey O. 2005. "Building Effective and Accountable Security Institutions in Africa: A Dialogue on Governance." [GFN Paper Number 101]. Cotonou, Benin: Global Facilitation Network for Security Sector Reform.

ISS (Institute for Security Studies) and MIM (Malawi Institute of Management). 2003. "HIV/AIDS and Attrition: Assessing the Impact on the Safety, Security and Access to Justice Sector in Malawi and Developing Appropriate Mitigation Strategies." Lilongwe, Malawi: ISS (Institute for Security Studies), MIM (Malawi Institute of Management).

ITU (International Telecommunications Union). 2003. "ICTs and The Millennium Development Goals." In *World Telecommunication Development Report 2003: Access Indicators for Information Society*. Geneva, Switzerland: ITU.

———. 2004. "Information and Communication Technology in the Atolls: Maldives Case Study." Male, Maldives: ITU.

IWGIA (International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs). 2000. "The Indigenous World 1999-2000." Copenhagen, Denmark.

———. 2001. "The Indigenous World 2000/2001." Copenhagen, Denmark.

———. 2002. "The Indigenous World 2001/2002." Copenhagen, Denmark.

———. 2003. "The Indigenous World 2002-2003." Copenhagen, Denmark.

———. 2005. "The Indigenous World 2005." Copenhagen, Denmark.

Jackson, Dorothy. 2004. "Implementation of International Commitments on Traditional Forest-related Knowledge: Indigenous Peoples' Experiences in Central Africa." Discussion paper.

Selim, Jahan. 2002. "Informal Sector in Developing Countries: Issues and Strategies," Rashid Amjad (ed.), Global Employment Forum Report, Geneva, ILO,March 2002, pp. 123-135.

Jahan, Selim. 2002a. "Millennium Development Goals and Governance: An Issues Note." UNDP (United Nations Development Programme).

———. 2002b. "Poverty Reduction and Governance: An Issues Note." UNDP (United Nations Development Programme).

———-. 2003a. "Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and Human Rights: An Issues Note." UNDP (United Nations Development Programme).

———-. 2003b. “Financing Millennium Development Goals: An Issues Paper-.” Manchester, UK; New York, USA: University of Manchester, UNDP (United Nations Development Programme).

———. 2005. “Reorienting Development: Towards and Engendered Employment Strategy.” New York, USA: UNDP (United Nations Development Programme).

Jaquette, Jane S. 2001. “Regional Differences and Contrasting Views.” *Journal of Democracy* 12(3):111-125.

Johnson, John K. and Robert Nakamura. 1999. Concept Paper on Legislatures and Good Governance. New York, USA: UNDP (United Nations Development Programme).

Joseph, Richard. 1999. “Democracy in Africa after 1989: Comparative and Theoretical Perspectives.” In Lisa Anderson, ed. *Transition to Democracy*. New York, USA: Columbia University Press.

Kahkonen, Satu. 2001. “Decentralization and Governance: Does Decentralization Improve Public Service Delivery?” *The World Bank PREM Notes* (55).

Karanja, Wangui and Mosi Kisare. 2002. *Three Days of Discovery: Tanzanian CSOs Examine Their Performance in Managing Change Between 1995 and 2002*. Arusha, Tanzania: East African Support Unit for NGOs.

Kaufman, Daniel. 2004. “Human Rights and Development: Toward Mutual Reinforcement.” New York, USA: EGI (Ethical Globalization Initiative), NYU Center for Human Rights and Global Justice.

Kauzya, John-Mary and Jide Balogun. 2005. “Governance and Public Administration Reforms and Innovations in African Countries: A Focus on Achievements, Setbacks and Future Directions.” Johannesburg, South Africa: UNDESA (United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs), UNDP (United Nations Development Programme).

Kempf, Isabell. 2004. Expert Workshop on Data Collection and Disaggregation on Indigenous Peoples. [PFII/2004/WS.1/7]. New York, USA: UNDESA (United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs).

Keuleers, Patrick. 2003. “The Merit System Versus Political Appointments” Substantive Research Paper. Bangkok, Thailand: UNDP (United Nations Development Programme).

———. 2004. “Governance in the Least Developed Countries in Asia and the Pacific: An Assessment of the Current Situation.” Bangkok, Thailand: UNDP (United Nations Development Programme).

Keuleers, Patrick. 2004. “An Analysis of Public Administration Reform in Cambodia, Mission Report,” UNDP RCB, December.

Khembo, Nixon S. 2004. “National Integrity Systems Country Study Report: Malawi 2004.” Transparency International.

Khor, Martin. 2004. “Patents and Access to Medicines: What Can Be Done at National Level?” *TWN Briefing Paper*(23).

Khosla, Romi and Jane Samuels. 2005. *Removing Unfreedoms: Citizens as Agents of Change in Urban Development*. Colchester, UK: ITDG Publishing, DFID (Department for International Development).

Kiai, Wambui. 2000. “Media Functions in HIV/AIDS Prevention and Management.” In S. T. Kwame Boafo and Carlos A. Arnaldo, eds. *Media and HIV/AIDS in East and Southern Africa: A Resource Book*. Paris, France: UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization).

Kinne, Brandon J. 2005. "Decision Making in Autocratic Regimes: A Poliheuristic Perspective." *International Studies Perspectives* (6):114-128.

Kirugu, Kithinji. 1998. "Civil Service Reform in Southern and Eastern Africa: Lessons of Experience." Nairobi, Kenya: KK Consulting Associates.

Kleinfeld Belton, Rachel. 2005. "Competing Definitions of the Rule of Law: Implications for Practitioners." [Rule of Law Series No. 55]. Washington, USA: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Kovach, Hetty, Caroline Neligan and Simon Burall. 2003. "Power Without Accountability? The Global Accountability Report 2003." London, UK: One World Trust.

Krafchik, Warren. 2003. "What Role Can Civil Society and Parliament Play in Strengthening the External Auditing Function?" Washington, USA: The International Budget Project.

Krasner, Stephen D. 2004. "Sharing Sovereignty: New Institutions for Collapse and Failing States." *International Security* 29(2):85-120.

Krause, Volker and Susumu Suzuki. 2005. "Causes of Civil War in Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa: A Comparison." *Social Science Quarterly* 86(1).

Krishna, Anirudh. 2000. "Changing Policy and Practice from Below: Community Experiences in Poverty Reduction; an Examination of Nine Case-Studies." New York, USA: UNDP (United Nations Development Programme).

Krishnan, Gopakumar. 2001. "Increasing Information Access to Improve Political Accountability and Participation: Mapping Future Actions in Asia Pacific." Tokyo, Japan: Privacy International.

———. 2002. "Corruption in South Asia: Insights and Benchmarks from Citizen Feedback Surveys in Five Countries." Transparency International.

LaFraniere, Sharon. 2005. "Africa Tackles Graft, With Billion in Aid in Play." *The New York Times*. 6 July 2005.

Land, A. 2004. *Developing capacity for tax administration: The Rwanda Revenue Authority*. (ECDPM Discussion Paper 57D). Maastricht: ECDPM.

Landman, Todd. 2005. "Measuring Human Rights: Principle, Practice, and Policy." *Human Rights Quarterly* 26:906-931.

Large, Daniel. 2005. *Corruption in Post-War Reconstruction: Confronting the Vicious Circle*: The Lebanese Transparency Association, UNDP (United Nations Development Programme), TIRI (The Governance Access Learning Network).

Leander, Silvia. 2005. "Burkina Faso Case Study on Anti-Corruption." New York, USA: UNDP (United Nations Development Programme).

Lewis, David, Anthony J. Bebbington, Simon P. J. Batterbury, Alpa Shah, Elizabeth Olson, Shameem Siddiqui and Sandra Duvall. 2003. "Practice, Power and Meaning: Frameworks for Studying Organizational Culture in Multi-Agency Rural Development Projects." *Journal of International Development* (15):541-557.

Lewis, W. Arthur. 1955. *The Theory of Economic Growth*. London, UK: George Allen and Unwin Ltd.

Liew, Jeff. 2000. "Traditional Strengths and Modern Technologies: Exploring and Building Synergy in the Pacific." In Anirudh Krishna, ed. *Changing Policy and Practice from Below: Community Experiences in Poverty Reduction — An Examination of Nine Case-Studies.* New York, USA: UNDP (United Nations Development Programme).

Linz, Juan J. and Alfred Stepan. 1996. "Toward Consolidates Democracies." *Journal of Democracy* 7(2):14-33.

Lister, Sarah. 2005. "Power in Partnership? An Analysis of an NGO's Relationship with Its Partners." [CVO International Working Paper Number 5]. London, UK: London School of Economics.

Lloyd-Laney, Megan. 2003. "Making Knowledge Networks Work for the Poor: Final Report." Rugby, UK: Intermediate Technology Development Group

Loewenson, Rene and Alan Whiteside. 2001. "Turning the Tide: Counteracting HIV/AIDS Impact on Human Development Goals." Mimeo.

Loewenson, Rene. 2001. "HIV/AIDS: Implications for Poverty Reduction." New York, USA: UNDP (United Nations Development Programme).

Lopes, Carlos and Thomas Theisohn. 2003. *Ownership, Leadership and Transformation. Can We Do Better for Capacity Development?* New York, USA: Earthscan Publications Ltd.

Lopez-Claros, Augusto and Saadia Zahidi. 2005. "Women's Empowerment: Measuring the Global Gender Gap." Geneva, Switzerland: World Economic Forum.

Lorent, Albert. Lorent, Albert, ed. 2004. *Aux Sources de la Démocratie, le Mouvement Associatif: Une Étude Monographique de 25 Associations et Organizations de Développement au Chad*. N'Djaména, Chad: Département Études et Médias, CEFOD (Centre d' Étude et de Formation pour le Développement).

Luckham, Robin, Anne Marie Goetz and Mary Kaldor. 1999. "Democratic Institutions and Politics in Context of Inequality, Poverty, and Conflict." [IDS Working Paper 104]. Brighton, UK: IDS (Institute of Development Studies), University of Sussex.

Luckham, Robin, Ismael Ahmed, Robert White and Sarah Muggah. 2001. "Conflict and Poverty in Sub-Saharan Africa: an Assessment of the Issues and Evidence." [IDS Working Paper 128]. Brighton, UK: Institute of Development Studies.

MacKenzie, Ueantabo Neemia. 2004. "National Integrity Systems Country Study Report: Kiribati 2004." Transparency International.

MacLean, Sandra J., Fahimul Quadir and Timothy M. Shaw. 2001. *Crisis of Governance in Asia and Africa*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.

Mahbub Ul Haq Human Development Centre. 1999. "Human Development in South Asia 1999: The Crisis of Governance." New Delhi, India: Vedam Books.

———. 2004. "Human Development in South Asia 2003: The Employment Challenge." New Delhi, India: Vedam Books.

Mahmood, Waseem. 2001. "Policy Analysis of Electronic Media Practises in South Asia: A Comparative Study." Birmingham, UK: UNDP (United Nations Development Programme), BMC (Baltic Media Centre).

Manby, Bronwen. 2004. "The African Union, NEPAD, and Human Rights: The Missing Agenda." *Human Rights Quarterly* 26(4):983-1027.

Mandaza, Ibbo. Mandaza, Ibbo, ed. 1998. *Governance and Human Development in Southern Africa*. Harare, Zimbabwe: SAPPHO.

Manning, Nick. 1999. "Using an Ombudsman to Oversee Public Officials." *The World Bank PREM Notes* (19).

Manohar, Sujata. 2002. "Trafficking in Women and Girls." [EGM/TRAF/2002.WP.1]. Glen Clove, USA: United Nations.

Matheson, Michael. 2001. "United Nations Governance of Post Conflict Societies." *The American Journal of International Law* 95:76-85.

McVay, Mary. 2002. "An Information Revolution for Small Enterprise in Africa: Experience in Interactive Radio Formats in Africa." [SEED Working Paper No. 27]. Geneva, Switzerland; ILO (International Labour Organization). Series on Innovation and Sustainability in Business Support Services (FIT).

McCord, Michael R. 1997. "The Challenges of Constitution-Making in Eritrea." *African Voices, Newsletter on Democracy and Governance in Africa* 6(3):3-4.

Meagher, Patrick. 2005. "Service Delivery in Fragile States: An Issues Paper." Washington, USA: USAID (United States Agency for International Development).

Mellor, Thuy and Jak Jabes. 2004. "Governance in the Pacific: Focus for Action 2005-2009." Manila, Philippines: ADB (Asian Development Bank).

Milliken, Jennifer and Keith Krause. 2002. "State Failure, State Collapse, and State Reconstruction: Concepts, Lessons and Strategies." *Development and Change* 33(5):753-774.

Modi, Vijay. 2005. "Energy Services for the Poor." New York, USA: United Nations Millennium Project.

Mohanty, Manoranjan, Partha Nath Mukherji and Olle Tornquist. 1998. *People's Rights: Social Movements and the State in the Third World*. New Delhi, India; Thousand Oaks, USA: Sage Publications.

Mold, Andrew, and UN ECA (United Nations Economic Commission for Africa). 2005. "Trade Preferences and Africa: The State of Play and Issues at Stake." [ATPC Work in Progress No. 12]. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: ATPC (African Trade Policy Centre) at UN ECA (United Nations Economic Commission for Africa).

Molland, Sverre. 2005. "Human Trafficking and Poverty Reduction: Two Sides of the Same Coin?" *Juth Pakai: Sharing Information to Stimulate Development* (4):27-37.

Moore, Mick and James Putzel. 1999. "Thinking Strategically About Politics and Poverty." [IDS Working Paper 101]. Brighton, UK: Institute of Development Studies.

Moore, Mick. 2001. "Political Underdevelopment: What Causes 'Bad Governance'." *Public Management Review* 3(3):385-418.

Moravsik, Andrew. 2004. "'Democracy Deficit' in World Politics? A Framework for Analysis." *Government and Opposition* 39(2):336-363.

Moreno Torres, Magui and Michael Anderson. 2004. "Fragile States: Defining Difficult Environments for Poverty Reduction." [PRDE Working Paper 1]. London, UK: DFID (UK Department for International Development).

Mozammel, Masud and Sina Odugbemi. "With the Support of Multitudes: Using Strategic Communication to Fright Poverty through PRSPs." London, UK: DFID (UK Department of International Development), World Bank.

Musoni, Protais. 2005. "Decentralised Governance and Civic Engagement for Poverty Reduction, Peace Building and Consolidation of Democracy." Speech delivered at Regional Forum on Reinventing Government in Africa, Johannesburg, South Africa, January 2005.

Mwinga, Mwene. 2002. *Civil Society and the Poverty Reduction Process in Zambia*. Lusaka, Zambia: KEPA (Service Centre for Development Cooperation).

Dani Wadada Nabudere, "*The Politica l Economy of Conflict and War in the Great Lakes Region*," online: "http://www.ijr.org.za/publications/nabudere"

Nakirunda, Maureen. 2001. *Civil Society – State Relations: ACFODE's Claims for Gender Equality*. Kampala, Uganda: Centre for Basic Research.

Nathan, Laurie. 2000. "The Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse: The Structural Causes of Crisis and Violence in Africa." *Peace and Change* 25(2):188-207.

Ndegwa, Stephen N. 2001. "Governance, Peace and Social Stability." New York, USA: UNDP (United Nations Development Programme).

———. 2002. "Decentralization in Africa: A Stocktaking Survey." [Africa Region Working Paper Series No. 40]. Washington, USA: World Bank.

———. 2003. "Decentralization in Africa: Emerging Trends and Progress." *Findings* (229).

NDI (the National Democratic Institute). 2004. "Assessment of the Opportunities and the Challenges to the Development of Political Parties in the Maldives." Washington, USA.

Nederlandse Organisatie voor Internationale Bijstand. 2003. *Mapping Somali Civil Society: Working Draft*. Nairobi, Kenya: OXFAM Netherlands.

Neou, Kassie. 2000. "Human Rights in Action: Developing Partnerships Between Government and Civil Society — Our Unique Non-Confrontational Approach in Cambodia." Human Development Report. New York, USA: UNDP (United Nations Development Programme).

Netherlands Institute of International Relations Clingendael, International Alert, and Saferworld. 2002. "Towards a Better Practice Framework in Security Sector Reform: Broadening the Debate." 2002.

Neumayer, Eric. 2002. "Is Good Governance Rewarded? A Cross-national Analysis of Debt Forgiveness." *World Development* 30(6):913-930.

Newbury, Colin. 2000. "Patrons, Clients, and Empire: The Subordination of Indigenous Hierarchies in Asia and Africa." *Journal of World History* 11(2):227-263.

Nguyen, L. 2005. "Poor Victimized by Extortion, Large and Small." Inter Press Service News Agency, 20 September 2005.

Nohlen, Dieter, Michael Krennerich and Bernhard Thibaut. Nohlen, Dieter, Michael Krennerich and Bernhard Thibaut, eds. 1999. *Elections in Africa: A Data Handbook*. Oxford, UK; New York, USA: Oxford University Press.

Nohlen, Dieter, Florian Grotz and Christof Hartmann. Nohlen, Dieter, Florian Grotz and Christof Hartmann, eds. 2001. *Elections in Asia and the Pacific: A Data Handbook*. Oxford, UK; New York, USA: Oxford University Press.

Norlund, Anja Taarup. 2004. "Demands for Electoral Gender Quotas in Afghanistan and Iraq." [Working Paper Series 2004: 2]. Stockholm, Sweden: University of Stockholm.

Norris, Pippa.2004. "Implementing Women's Representation in Afghanistan's Electoral Law: Options for Reserved Seats." New York, USA: Center on International Cooperation, New York University; Cambridge, USA: John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.

Norris, Pippa and Dieter Zinnbauer. 2002. "Giving Voice to the Voiceless: Good Governance, Human Development and Mass Communication." New York, USA: UNDP (United Nations Development Programme).

Norris, Pippa. 2005. "Stable Democracy and Good Governance in Divided Societies: Do Power-Sharing Institutions Work? [RWP05 -014]. Cambridge, USA: Harvard University.

Nyang'oro, Julius Edo. Nyang'oro, Julius Edo, ed. 1999. *Civil Society and Democratic Development in Africa: Perspectives from Eastern and Southern Africa*. Harare, Zimbabwe: MWENGO.

Nzongola-Ntalaja, Georges. 2004. "Democratic Governance and Human Rights in the International Framework." Helsinki, Finland: Oslo Governance Centre.

Nzongola-Ntalaja, Georges. "The International Dimensions of the Congo www.undp.org/oslocentre/docs05/The%20International%20Dimensions%20of%20the %20Congo%20Crisis.pdf

O'Donnell, Guillermo. 2000. "The Judiciary and the Rule of Law." *Journal of Democracy* 11(1):25-31.

———. 2004. "Why the Rule of Law Matters." *Journal of Democracy* 15(4):32-46.

O'Neil, William. 2004. "Police Reform and Human Rights: A HURIST Document." New York, USA: UNDP (United Nations Development Programme).

O'Neill, Daniel P. 2004. "When to Intervene: The Haitian Dilemma." *SAIS Review* XXIV (2).

Odinkalu, Chidi A. and Camilla Christensen. 1998. "The African Commission on Human and People's Rights: The Development of its Non-State Communication Procedures." *Human Rights Quarterly* 20(2):235-280.

OECD (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development). 2005. "Living Up to the Capacity Development Challenge: Lessons and Good Practices." [DCD/DAC/GOVNET(2005)4]. Paris, France: OECD.

OECD (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development) and Paris 21. 2005. "What is Metagora Accomplishing? Summary of Intermediary Project's Result as of May 13th 2005; A Project Focusing on Methods, Tools and Frameworks for Measuring Democracy, Human Rights and Governance. 2005." Paris, France: OECD-DCD, Paris 21.

Olowu, Dele. 2003. "Local Institutions and Political Structures and Processes: Recent Experience in Africa." *Public Administration and Development* 23(1):41-52.

Onyach-Olaa, Martin. 2003. "The Challenges of Implementing Decentralisation: Recent Experiences in Uganda." *Public Administration and Development* 23:105-113.

Opio-Odongo, Joseph and Charles Lwanga-Ntale. 2000. "Partnership and Empowerment through Participation: Some Lessons from Uganda." In Anirudh Krishna, ed. *Changing Policy and Practice from Below: Community Experiences in Poverty Reduction - An Examination of Nine Case-Studies.* New York, USA: UNDP (United Nations Development Programme).

Otobo, Ejeviome Eloho. 2000. "Contemporary External Influences on Corporate Governance: Coping with the Challenges in Africa." Paper prepared for the African Development Bank.

Ottaway, Marina. 2002. "Rebuilding State Institutions in Collapsed States." *Development and Change* 33(5):1001-1023.

Ottaway, Marina and Stefan Mair. 2004. "States at Risk and Failed States: Putting Security First." Washington, USA: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace; Berlin, Germany: SWP (German Institute for International and Security Affairs).

Ouedraogo, Hubert M. G. 2003. "Decentralisation and Local Governance: Experiences from Francophone West Africa." *Public Administration and Development* 23:97-103.

OXFAM International and Amnesty International. 2003. "Shattered Lives: The Case for Tough International Arms Control." London, UK: OXFAM International, Amnesty International.

OXFAM International. 2003. "Robbing the Poor to Pay the Rich? How United States Keeps Medicines from the World's Poorest." OXFAM Briefing Paper. London, UK: OXFAM International.

Papan, Andrea S. 2003. "UNDP Case Studies on Anti-Corruption: Mozambique." Mimeo.

Paris, Roland. 2001. "Human Security: Paradigm Ship or Hot Air?" *International Security* 26(2):87-102.

Pasha, Hafiz. 2004. "When Textile Quotas Disappear." *International Herald Tribune*, 30 December 2004.

PCIL (Philippine Center for Investigative Journalism). Coronel, Sheila S., ed. 2001. *The Right to Know: Access to Information in Southeast Asia*. Quezon City, Philippines: PCIL (Philippine Center for Investigative Journalism), SEAPA (Southeast Asian Press Alliance), UNDP (United Nations Development Programme).

Pereira, Joao C. G. and Yul Derek Davids. 2002. "Political Reforms in Mozambique: Attitudes to Democracy among Ordinary People." In Henning Melber, ed. *Measuring Democracy and Human Rights in Southern Africa*. Uppsala, Sweden: Nordiska Afrikainstitutet.

Pickering, Jeffrey and Emizet F. Kisangani. 2005. "Democracy and Diversionary Military Intervention: Reassessing Regime Type and the Diversionary Hypothesis." *International Studies Quarterly* (49):23-43.

Plattner, Marc F. 1995. "The Uses of 'Civil Society'." *Journal of Democracy* 6(4):169-173.

———. 2005. "Building Democracy after Conflict: Introduction." *Journal of Democracy* 16(1):5-8.

Polidano, Charles. 2001. "Why Civil Service Reforms Fail." [IDPM Public Policy and Management Working Paper no. 16]. Manchester, UK: IDPM.

Poulton, Robin E., Ibrahim ag Youssouf and Mahamane Baby. 2000. "Peacemaking and Sustainable Human Development: Big Pictures or Small Projects: Collaboration between UNDP and Civil Society in Mali." In Anirudh Krishna, ed. *Changing Policy and Practice from Below: Community Experiences in Poverty Reduction — An Examination of Nine Case-Studies.* New York, USA: UNDP (United Nations Development Programme).

Price, Monroe E., Stacy Sullivan, Lin A. Neumann and Hervé Deguine. 2000. "Reconstructing the Media in Post Conflict Societies: Four Perspectives. The Experiences of Intergovernmental and Non-Governmental Organizations." *Cardozo Online Journal of Conflict Resolution* 2(1):1-56.

Price, Richard. 2003. "Transnational Civil Society and Advocacy in World Politics." *World Politics* (55):579-606.

Quah, Jon S. T. 1999. "Corruption in Asian Countries: Can It Be Minimized?" *Public Administration Review* 59(6).

Radnitzky, Gerard. 2000. "Hayek on the Role of the State: a Radical Libertarian Critique." *Policy*: 16-20.

Ragmee, Rama Krishna and Devendra Raj Panday. 2001. "National Integrity Systems Country Study Report: Nepal 2001." Transparency International.

Rahman, Atiur et. al. "*Infrastructure and Poverty Reduction in Bangladesh*," Report prepared for the Japan-UNDP Project on Infrastructure and Poverty Reduction, New York, 2005.

Rakotondramboa, Yveline and Dominique Rakotomalala. 2005. "Transparency International: Madagascar." Mimeo.

Republic of Mozambique. 2005. "Anti-Corruption Strategy General Guidelines (2005-2009)." Maputo, Mozambique.

Reynolds, Andrew. 2005. "Building Democracy after Conflict: Constitutional Medicine." *Journal of Democracy* 16(1):54-68.

Ribot, Jesse C. 2003. "Democratic Decentralisation of Natural Resources: Institutional Choice and Discretionary Power Transfers in Sub-Sahara Africa." *Public Administration and Development* 23:53-65.

Robalino, David A., Carol Jenkins and Karim El Maroufi. 2002. "Risks and Macroeconomic Impact of HIV/AIDS in the Middle East and North Africa: Why Waiting to Intervene Can Be Costly." [World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 2874]. Washington, USA: World Bank.

Roberts, John. 2003. "Managing Public Expenditure for Development Results and Poverty Reduction." [Working Paper 203]. London, UK: Overseas Development Institute.

Romeo, Leonardo G. 2003. "The Role of External Assistance in Supporting Decentralization Reform." *Public Administration and Development* 23:89-96.

Rondinelli, Dennis A. 2005. "Revitalizing Public Administration: Strategic Directions for the Future." [E/C.16/2005.2]. New York, USA: United Nations.

Rose, Laurel. 2002. "Women's Strategies for Customary Land Access in Swaziland and Malawi: A Comparative Study." *Africa Today* 49(2):123-149.

Rotberg, Robert I. 2002. "The New Nature of Nation-State Failure." *The Washington Quarterly* 25(3):85-96.

———. 2003. "The Roots of Africa's Leadership Deficit." *Compass: A Journal of Leadership*.

———. 2003. *When States Fail*. Princeton, USA: Princeton University Press.

———. 2004. "Strengthening Governance: Ranking Countries Would Help." *The Washington Quarterly* 28(1):71-81.

Rotberg, Robert I. and Deborah L. West. 2004. "The Good Governance Problem: Doing Something about It." [WPR Reports Number 39]. Cambridge, USA: John F Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University, World Peace Foundation.

Roughan, Paul. 2004. "National Integrity Systems Country Study Report: Solomon Islands 2004." Transparency International.

Rowley, Charles K. 1996. "What is Living and What is Dead in Classical Liberalism?" *The Independent Review* 1(1):9-28.

Roy, Chandra K. 2004. "Indigenous Women: A Gender Perspective." Oslo, Norway: Resource Center for the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

Roy, Raja Devasish. 2005. "Traditional Customary Laws and Indigenous Peoples in Asia." London, UK: Minority Rights Group International.

Rubin, Bernett R. 2004. "Crafting a Constitution for Afghanistan." *Journal of Democracy* 15(13).

Rudra, Nita. 2002. "Globalization and the Decline of the Welfare State in Less-Developed Countries." *International Organization* 56(2):411-445.

Sabally, Hawa S. and Demba A. Jawo. 2004. "National Integrity Systems Questionnaire: The Gambia 2004." Transparency International

Sabatini, Christopher. 2002. "Who Do International Donors Support in the Name of Civil Society?" Unpublished manuscript.

Sachikonye, Lloyd. Sachikonye, Lloyd, ed. 1995. *Democracy, Civil Society, and the State: Social Movements in Southern Africa*. Harare, Zimbabwe: SAPES Books.

Sachs, Jeffrey. 2003. "Institutions Don't Rule: Direct Effects of Geography on Per Capita Income." NBER Working Paper [No. w 9490]. Cambridge, USA: NBER (National Bureau of Economic Research).

Saif, Ahmed A. 2001. *A Legislature in Transition: the Yemeni Parliament*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.

Salam, A. H. Abdel and Alex de Waal. 2001. *The Phoenix State: Civil Society and the Future of Sudan*. Lawrenceville, USA: Red Sea Press.

Saldanha, Cedric. 2004. "Strategies for Good Governance in the Pacific." *Asian-Pacific Economic Literature* 18(2):30-43.

Sambanis, Nicholas. 2004. "Poverty and the Organization of Political Violence." In Susan M Collins and Carol Graham, eds. *Brookings Trade Forum: 2004. Globalization, Poverty, and Inequality.* Washington, USA: Brookings Institution Press.

SARIPS (Southern Africa Regional Institute for Policy Studies). 1998. "SADC Regional Human Development Report 1998." Harare, Zimbabwe.

Schedler, Andreas, Larry Diamond and Marc F. Plattner. 1999. *The Self Restraining State" Power and Accountability in New Democracies*. Boulder, USA: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc.

Schilderman, Theo. 2002. "Strengthening the Knowledge and Information Systems of the Urban Poor." London, UK: DFID (UK Department for International Development).

Schmidt, Harriet. 2003. "Progress in the Implementation of the Brussels Programme of Action: The Challenges Ahead." Bangkok, Thailand: UN ESCAP (United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific).

Schmitter, Philippe C. 2004. "The Ambiguous Virtues of Accountability." *Journal of Democracy* 15(4):47-60.

Aaron Schneider and Mick Moore. 2003, "Measuring pro-poorness: does decentralisation help the poor?" id21 Research Highlight: 17 February 2003, Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex, UK. "http://www.id21.org/society/s8aas1g1.html"

Schwartz, Daniel, and Ashbindu Singh. 1999. "Environmental Conditions, Resources and Conflicts: An Introductory Overview and Data Collection." Nairobi, Kenya: UNEP (United Nations Environment Programme).

Schwedler, Jillian. 2002. "Yemen's Aborted Opening." *Journal of Democracy* 13(4):48-55.

Selian, Audrey N. 2002. "ICTs in Support of Human Rights, Democracy and Good Governance." Geneva, Switzerland: ITU (International Telecommunications Union).

Selim, Rasheda. 2003. "Gender Dimensions of Poverty and HIV/AIDS: A Statistical Review of Six Countries." *Development Policy Journal* 3:81-100.

Sen, Amartya. 1981. *Poverty and Famines: An Essay on Entitlement and Deprivation*. Oxford, UK: Clerendon Press.

———. 1990. "Development as Capability Expansion." In K. Griffin and J. Knight, eds. *Human Development and the International Development Strategy for the 1990s.* London, UK: Mac Millan Press.

Sen, Amartya and Sudhir Anand. 1997. "Concepts of Human Development and Poverty: A Multidimensional Perspective." New York, USA: UNDP (United Nations Development Programme).

Sen, Amartya. 1999. *Development as Freedom*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

———. 1999. "Democracy as a Universal Value." *Journal of Democracy* 10(3):3-17.

Shah, Babar. 2004. "The Constitution Process in Afghanistan." Islamabad, Pakistan: ISS (Institute of Strategic Studies).

Shaw, Mark. 2000. "Crime and Policing in Transitional Society — Conference Summary and Overview." Braamfontein, South Africa: SAIIA (South African Institute of International Affairs).

Sheehan, James. 2005. "NGOs and Participatory Management Styles: A Case Study of CONCERN Worldwide, Mozambique." [CVO International Working Paper Number 2]. London, UK: London School of Economics.

Shell Foundation and Forum for the Future. 2004. "Sustainable Investment in Africa: Pipedream or Possibility? Innovative Financing Mechanisms for Small and Medium Sized Enterprises in Africa." London, UK: Forum for the Future, Shell Foundation.

Shelton, James D. et al. 2002."Partner Reduction in HIV Prevention: The Neglected Middle Child of 'ABC'." US Agency for International Development and Uganda AIDS Commission's National Aids and Information Centre, "ABC" Experts Technical Meeting, Washington, D.C September 17.

Sheptycki, James. 2000. "Policing and Human Rights: An Introduction." *Policing and Society* 11:1-10.

Shetty, Salil. 2005. "The Millennium Campaign: Getting Governments to Keep their Promises." *Development* 48(1):25-29.

Shultz, Jim. 2005. "Follow the Money: A Guide to Monitoring Budgets and Oil and Gas Revenues." New York, USA: Open Society Institute.

Shuster, Don, Peter Larmour and Karin von Strokirch. Shuster, Don, Peter Larmour and Karin von Strokirch, eds. 1998. *Leadership in the Pacific Islands: Tradition and the Future*. Canberra, Australia: National Centre for Development Studies, Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, Australian National University.

Sibounheuang, Lanngsy. 2004. "Combating Fraud and Corruption for the Transparency and Effectiveness of Public Management in Lao P.D.R." Hanoi, Viet Nam.

Silva-Leander, Sebastian. 2005. "UNDP Case Study on Anti-Corruption: Burkina Faso." UNDP (United Nations Development Programme). Mimeo.

Simie, E. 2000. "Ethiopia Case Study: Water Utilities Partnership, Project No. 5." Mimeo.

SIPA (School of International and Public Affairs). Forthcoming. "Financing Development: Challenges for the Millennium Development Goals." *Journal of International Affairs*.

Sisk, Timothy D. 2005. "Democracy at the Local Level: The International IDEA Handbook on Participation, Representation, Conflict Management, and Governance." [International IDEA Handbook Series 4]. Stockholm, Sweden: International IDEA.

Sklar, Richard L. 2004. "On the Study of Constitutional Government in Africa." In Okon Akiba, ed. *Constitutionalism and Society in Africa.* Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.

Smulovitz, Catalina and Enrique Peruzzotti. 2000. "Societal and Horizontal Controls: Two Cases about a Fruitful Relationship." South Bend, USA: University of Notre Dame.

Snow, Thomas, Michael Faye, John McArthur and Jeffrey Sachs. 2003. "Country Case Studies on the Challenges Facing Landlocked Developing Countries." New York, USA: UNDP (United Nations Development Programme).

Social Watch. 2003. "Social Watch Report 2003: The Poor and the Market." Montevideo, Uruguay.

———. 2004. "Social Watch Report 2004: Fear and Want: Obstacle to Human Security." Montevideo, Uruguay.

Staibano, Carina and Peter Wallensteen. 2004. "Attention and Commitment: Practical Approaches in Bridging Gaps in UN's Post-Conflict Peace Building." Mimeo.

Stapenhurst, Rick. 2000. "The Media's Role in Curbing Corruption." Washington, USA: World Bank Institute.

Stapleton, Adam. 2002. "Paralegal Aid in Africa: A Case Study from Malawi." *Corrections Today* 64(1):34-37.

Stewart, Frances. 1998. "The Root Causes of Conflict: Some Conclusions." [QEH Working Paper Series Number 16 (QEHWPS16)]. 1998. Oxford, UK: Queen Elizabeth House, University of Oxford.

Stockholm International Peace Research Institute. 2005. *SIPRI Yearbook 2004: Armaments, Disarmaments, and International Security*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Stone, Christopher E. and Heather H. Ward. 2000. "Democratic Policing." *Policing and Society* 10:11-45.

Strohmeyer, Hansjorg. 2001. "Collapse and Reconstruction of Judicial System: The United Nations Missions in Kosovo and East Timor." *The American Journal of International Law* 95(46).

Sutter, Raymond. 2004. "Transformation of Political Parties in Africa Today." *Transformation* 55:1-27.

Taafaki, Tauaasa. 2004. "National Integrity Systems Country Study Report: Tuvalu 2004." Transparency International.

Tamang, Parshuram and Bijay Kumar Singh. 2004. "An Assessment of the Implementation of the Nepalese Government's International Commitments on Traditional Forest Related Knowledge (TFRK) from the Perspective of Indigenous Peoples." San Jose, Costa Rica,

Tettley, Wisdom J. 2002. "The Media, Accountability and Civil Engagement in Africa." New York, USA: UNDP (United Nations Development Programme).

The Danish Institute for Human Rights. 2004a. "Supporting National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights: A Strategic Niche for UNDP? – Issues Paper." Mimeo.

———. 2004b. "Supporting National Human Rights Institutions: A Strategic Niche for UNDP? – Country Report Rwanda." Mimeo.

———. 2005. "Supporting National Human Rights Institutions: A Strategic Niche for UNDP? – Country Report Uganda." Mimeo.

———. 2005b. "Strengthening CSO Budget Participation, Burkina Faso." Newsletter (No.26).

TUGI (The Urban Governance Initiative). 2005. "Issues Report Card Good Governance: Civil Society Participation; Developing Capacities for Good Urban Governance." Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia: TUGI.

Udogu, E. Ike. 2004. "The Transition to Democratic Governance in Africa." *Journal of Third World Studies* 21(2):216-220.

UNDESA (United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs). 2003a. "World Statistics Pocketbook Least Developed Countries." [Special Issue – Series V No. 26/LDC]. New York, USA: United Nations.

UNDP and IPU (2003). "Ten Years of Strengthening Parliaments in Africa", 1991-2000, p.65.

———. 2003b. "Progress of the Least Developed Countries on the Millennium Development Goals." New York, USA: UNDESA.

———. 2005a. "Survey Report: NGO/Civil Society and Poverty Eradication in Least Developed Countries." New York, USA: UNDESA.

———. 2005b. "Poverty Reduction and Good Governance." New York, USA: UNDESA.

UN ECA (United Nations Economic Commission for Africa). 1999. African Development Forum 1999: Theme Papers. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: UN ECA.

———. 2000. "Governance, Peace and Social Stability – An Issues Note." [ESPD/ High Level/ 2000/4]. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: UN ECA.

———. 2003a. "Land Tenure Systems and Sustainable Development in Southern Africa." [ECA/SA/EGM.Land/2003/2]. Lusaka, Zambia: UN ECA.

———. 2003b. "Economic Report on Africa 2003: Accelerating the Pace of Development." Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: UN ECA.

———. 2004a. Fourth African Development Forum: Governance for a Progressive Africa. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: UN ECA.

———. 2004b. "Best Practices in the Participatory Approach to Delivery of Social Services." Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: UN ECA.

———. 2004c. "Scoring African Leadership for Better Health." Nairobi, Kenya: UN ECA.

———. 2004d. "Scaling Up AIDS Treatment in Africa: Issues and Challenges." Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: CHGA (Commission on HIV/AIDS and Governance in Africa), UN ECA.

———. 2005. "Striving for Good Governance in Africa." Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: UN ECA.

UN ESCAP (United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific). 2001. "Women's Organizations and Their Use of Information and Communication Technologies in the Caucasus and Central Asia Region: An Exploration Assessment." New York, USA: UN ESCAP.

UN ESCAP (United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific) and UNDP (United Nations Development Programme). 2005. "Voices of the Least Developed Countries of Asia and the Pacific: Achieving the Millennium Development Goals through a Global Partnership." New Delhi, India: Elsevier.

UN-HABITAT (United Nations Human Settlements Programme). 2001. "The State of the World's Cities." Nairobi, Kenya: UN-HABITAT.

———. 2003a. "Water and Sanitation for Cities." *Habitat Debate* 9(3).

———. 2003b. "Better Water and Sanitation for the Urban Poor." Nairobi, Kenya: European Communities and Water Utilities Partnerships, UN-HABITAT.

UN Millennium Project. 2005. "Investing in Development: A Practical Plan to Achieve the Millennium Development Goals." New York, USA: UNDP (United Nations Development Programme).

UNODCCP (United Nations Office for Drug Control and Crime Prevention). 2001. "Investigating the Links between Access to Justice and Governance Factors: An Objective Indicators' Approach." Research and Scientific Series, Global Programme against Corruption. Vienna, Austria: UN ODCCP.

UN-OHRLLS (Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Islands Developing States). 2002. Ministerial Conference of the Least Developed Countries: Cotonou Declaration 2002. Cotonou, Benin.

———. 2003. "Critical Importance of Water Issues for the Least Developed Countries (LDCs)." New York, USA.

———. 2004. "Ministerial Declaration: Report of the Economic and Social Council for 2004." [A/59/3/Part 1, Chapter III]. New York, USA: UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC).

UN-OHRLLS (Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Islands Developing States) and UNDP (United Nations Development Programme). 2005a. "Hope: Building Capacity. Least Developed Countries Meet the HIV/AIDS Challenge." New York, USA: UNDP, UN-OHRLLS.

———. 2005b. "Hoping and Coping: A Call for Action. The Capacity Challenge of HIV/AIDS in Least Developed Countries." New York, USA: UN-OHRLLS.

UNAIDS (Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS). 1999. "A Review of Household and Community Responses to the HIV/AIDS Epidemic in the Rural Areas of Sub-Saharan Africa." UNAIDS Best Practice Collection. Geneva, Switzerland: UNAIDS.

———. 2000. "Summary Booklet of Best Practices: The International Partnership against AIDS in Africa." UNAIDS Best Practice Collection. Geneva, Switzerland: UNAIDS.

———. 2003a. "Where There's a Will There's a Way: Nursing and Midwifery Champions in HIV/AIDS Care in Southern Africa." Geneva, Switzerland: UNAIDS.

———. 2003b. "Accelerating Action Against AIDS in Africa." Geneva, Switzerland: UNAIDS.

———. 2004a. "2004 Report on the Global AIDS Epidemic; Overcoming AIDS: The 'Next Agenda'." Geneva, Switzerland: UNAIDS.

———. 2004b. "AIDS Epidemic Update 2004." Geneva, Switzerland: UNAIDS.

———. 2004c. "An Exceptional Response to AIDS." Geneva, Switzerland: UNAIDS.

UNAIDS (Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS), UNIFEM (United Nations Development Fund for Women) and UNFPA (United Nations Population Fund). 2004. "Women and HIV/AIDS: Confronting the Crisis." Geneva, Switzerland; New York, USA: UNAIDS, UNFPA.

UNAIDS (Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS). 2005. "HIV-Related Stigma, Discrimination and Human Rights Violations: Case Studies of Successful Programmes." UNAIDS Best Practice Collection. Geneva, Switzerland: UNAIDS. .

UNAIDS (Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS) and UNICEF (United Nations Development Fund for Women). 2005. "Facing the Future Together: Report of the Secretary General's Task Force on Women, Girls, and HIV/AIDS in Southern Africa." Geneva, Switzerland: UNAIDS, UNICEF.

UNCTAD (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development). 2002. "The Least Developed Countries Report 2002: Escaping the Poverty Trap." New York, USA; Geneva, Switzerland: UNCTAD

———. 2003. "Economic Development in Africa: Trade Performance and Commodity Dependence." Geneva, Switzerland; New York, USA: UNCTAD

———. 2004a. "Development and Globalization: Facts and Figures." New York, USA; Geneva, Switzerland: UNCTAD.

———. 2004b. "The Least Developed Countries Report 2004: Linking International Trade with Poverty Reduction." New York, USA; Geneva, Switzerland: UNCTAD.

———. 2004c. "Handbook of Statistics." New York, USA: UNCTAD.

———. 2005. "The Least Developed Countries Report 2004: Overview by the Secretary-General of UNCTAD." New York, USA; Geneva, Switzerland: UNCTAD.

UNDP (United Nations Development Programme). 1995. "Public Sector Management, Governance, and Sustainable Human Development." New York, USA: UNDP.

———. 1997. "Governance for Sustainable Development." New York, USA: UNDP.

———. 1998. "Human Development Report 1998: Consumption for Human Development." New York, USA: UNDP.

———. 1999a. "Small and Medium Enterprise Development." *Essentials: Synthesis of Lessons Learned* (1).

———. 1999.b "Entrepreneurship Development." *Essentials: Synthesis of Lessons Learned* (2).

———. 1999c. "Pacific Human Development Report: Creating Opportunities." Suva, Fiji: UNDP.

———. 1999d. "Human Development Report 1999." New York, USA; Oxford, UK: UNDP.

———. 1999e. "Fighting Corruption to Improve Governance." New York, USA: UNDP.

———. 2000a. "The Round Table Process and the Private Sector: An Issue Paper".

———. 2000b. "Arab Parliamentary Development Symposium: UNDP Support to Legislatures in the Arab States." Beirut, Lebanon: UNDP.

———. 2000c. "Human Development Report 2000: Human Rights and Human Development." New York, USA: UNDP.

———. 2001a. "UNDP Legislative Assistance Retrospective." Mimeo.

———. 2001b. "UNDP Electoral Support Retrospective: Ten Years of Experience." New York, USA: UNDP.

———. 2001c. "UNDP Thematic Trust Fund: Poverty Reduction." New York, USA: UNDP.

———..2001d. "Human Development Report 2001: Making New Technologies Work for Human Development." New York, USA: UNDP.

———. 2002a. "Substantive Research Piece – East Timor: Global Experiences Using Expatriate Judges." 2002. Bangkok, Thailand: UNDP.

———. 2002b. "UNDP and Civil Society Organizations: A Policy Engagement." New York, USA: UNDP.

———. 2002c. "Results: HIV/AIDS." New York, USA: UNDP.

———. 2002d. “How UNDP Supports Parliaments.” New York, USA: UNDP.

———. 2002e. “UNDP and Civil Society: Partnerships at a Glance.” New York: UNDP.

———. 2002f. “Human Development Report 2002: Deepening Democracy in a Fragmented World.” New York, USA: UNDP.

———. 2002g. “Justice and Security Sector Reform: BCPR’s Programmatic Approach.” New York, USA: UNDP Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery (BCPR).

———. 2002h. “Capacity for Development: New Solutions to Old Problems.” New York, USA: UNDP.

———. 2002i. “Civic Engagement.” *Essentials: Synthesis of Lessons Learned* (8):1-13. New York, USA: UNDP.

UNDP HDR Bhutan 2000. online: www.undp.org.bt/NHDReport 2000.pdf

———-. 2003a. “Governance in the Asia and the Pacific Region: An Assessment of Current Trends.” Mimeo.

———-. 2003b. “Partners in Human Development: UNDP and Civil Society Organizations.” New York, USA: UNDP.

———. 2003c. “UNDP Practice Note: Disarmament, Demobilisation and Reintegration of Ex-Combatants.” New York, USA: UNDP.

———-. 2003d. “Conference Report: Coherence, Cooperation and Comparative Strengths.” Oslo, Norway: UNDP.

———. 2003e. “Arab Human Development Report: Building a Knowledge Society.” New York, USA: UNDP.

———. 2003f. “Regional Human Development Report - HIV/AIDS and Development in South Asia 2003.” New Delhi, India: UNDP.

———. 2003g. “Human Development Report 2003: Millennium Development Goals: A Compact among Nations to End Human Poverty.” New York, USA: UNDP.

———. 2003h. “Comparative Experiences of Police Reform in Transitional Societies.” Kathmandu, Nepal: UNDP.

———. 2003i. “UNDP Practice Note: Parliamentary Development.” New York, USA: UNDP.

———. 2003j. “UNDP Support for Local Elections: Comparative Experiences.” Kathmandu, Nepal: UNDP.

———. 2003k. “Millennium Development Goals: National Reports. A Look Through a Gender Lens.” New York, USA: UNDP.

———. 2003l. “UNDP Practice Note: Poverty Reduction and Human Rights.” New York, USA: UNDP.

———. 2003m. “UNDP Practice Note: Electoral Systems and Processes.” New York, USA: UNDP.

———. 2003n. “Equity News: A Breakthrough in Cambodian Election Broadcasting.” Phnom Penh, Cambodia: UNDP.

———. 2003o. “Making Global Trade Work for People.” London, UK; Sterling, USA: Earthscan Publications Ltd.

———. 2004a. “UNDP Case Studies on Anti-Corruption: Tanzania.”

———. 2004b. "UNDP Practice Note: Public Administration Reform." New York, USA: UNDP.

———. 2004c. "UNDP Practice Note: Anti-Corruption." New York, USA: UNDP.

———. 2004d. "Unleashing Entrepreneurship: Making Business Work for the Poor." New York, USA: UNDP.

———. 2004e. "Sub-Regional Launch UN Report on Unleashing Entrepreneurship — Making Business Work for the Poor and Workshop on SME Development in South Asia." New Delhi, India: UNDP.

———. 2004f. "UNDP Practice Note: Access to Justice." New York, USA: UNDP.

———. 2004g. "Challenges to Democracy." UNDP.

———. 2004h. "Global Project for Parliamentary Strengthening Phase II (GPSS II): Project Proposal." New York, USA: UNDP Democratic Governance Group (DGG), Bi-Communal Development Programme (BDP).

———. 2004i. "Exploring the Paths Toward Peace and Human Development." (Update). Oslo, Norway: Oslo Governance Center, UNDP.

———. 2004j. "Afghanistan Human Development Report 2004: Security with Human Face." New York, USA: UNDP.

———. 2004k. "Human Development Report 2004: Cultural Liberty in Today's Diverse World." New York, USA: UNDP.

———. 2004l. "Sharing Innovative Experiences: Examples of the Successful Conservation and Sustainable Use of Dryland Biodiversity." New York, USA: UNDP.

———. 2004m. "UNDP Practice Note: Decentralised Governance for Development. A Combined Practice Note on Decentralisation, Local Governance and Urban/Rural Development." New York, USA: UNDP.

———. 2004n. "UNDP Practice Note: Electoral Systems and Processes." New York, USA: UNDP.

———. 2004o. "Transformation across Borders: Addressing HIV/AIDS in the Asia Pacific Region." New York, USA: UNDP.

———. 2004p. "Local Electoral Systems in Southeast Asia: Cambodia." Mimeo.

———. 2004q. "Reducing Disaster Risk: A Challenge for Development – A Global Report." New York, USA: UNDP.

———. 2004r. "UNDP in Africa: Supporting Africa as It Meets the Challenges of the 21st Century." New York, USA: UNDP.

———. 2004s. "Deepening our Partnerships: Reflections on UNDP-funded Projects in The Gambia. Volume II." Banjul, the Gambia: UNDP.

———. 2005a. "Experiences from the Field: UNDP-CSO Partnerships for Conflict Prevention." New York, USA: UNDP Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery (BCPR), Bureau for Resources and Strategic Partnerships (BRSP).

———. 2005b. "Support to the Independent Administrative Reform and Civil Service Commission (IARCSC) in Establishing a Program for the Advancement of Women and the Promotion of Equal Opportunities in the Afghan Civil Service." Kabul, Afghanistan: UNDP.

———. 2005c. "Sourcebook on Building Partnerships with Civil Society Organizations." New York, USA: UNDP.

———. 2005d. “The Millennium Development Goals and the Private Sector: The Caribbean Business Experience.” Georgetown, Guyana: UNDP, UWI (Institute of Business).

———. 2005e. “Trends and Challenges in Public Administration Reform in Asia and Pacific.” Bangkok, Thailand: UNDP.

———. 2005f. “UNDP Primer: Fiscal Decentralisation and Poverty Reduction.” New York, USA: UNDP.

———. 2005g. “Programming for Justice: Access for All. A Practitioner's Guide to a Human Rights-Based Approach to Access to Justice.” Bangkok, Thailand: UNDP.

———. 2005h. “A Guide to Civil Society Organizations Working on Democratic Governance.” Oslo, Norway: Oslo Governance Centre, UNDP.

———. 2005i. “The Role of Civil Society in Local Governance and Poverty Alleviation: Concepts, Realities, and Experiences.” Tirana, Albania: UNDP.

———. 2005j. “UNDP and Indigenous Peoples: A Policy of Engagement.” New York, USA: UNDP.

———. 2005k. “Arab Human Development Report 2004: Towards Freedom in the Arab World.” New York, USA: UNDP.

———. 2005l. “Concept Note: Support to the Implementation of Afghanistan's New Constitution.” Mimeo.

———. 2005m. “UNDP Practice Note: Human Rights.” New York, USA: Democratic Governance Group, UNDP.

———. 2005n. “Empowering and Engendering Governance Indicators.” New Delhi, India: UNDP.

———. 2005o. “The Sustainable Difference: Energy and Environment to Achieve the MDGs.” New York, USA: UNDP.

———. 2005p. “Monitoring Gender Issues in the Nepalese Print Media.” Kathmandu, Nepal: UNDP, Press Council Nepal.

———. 2005q. “Yemen Human Development Report 1998.” Sanaa, Yemen: UNDP.

———. 2005r. “Human Development Report 2005: International Cooperation at a Crossroads; Aid, Trade and Security in an Unequal World.” New York, USA: UNDP.

———. 2005s. “A Global Review: UNDP Support to Institutional and Legislative Systems for Disaster Risk Management - Executive Summary.” New York, USA: UNDP Disaster Reduction Unit, Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery (BCPR).

———. 2005t. “UNDP Launches Hotline for Free legal Assistance and Supports Automates Legal Information and Case Management System.” Sanaa, Yemen: UNDP.

———. 2005u. “Handbook on Opportunities in Political Party Programming: UNDP Experiences and Perspectives.” New York, USA: UNDP.

———. 2005v. “The G8 Summit: The Aid Equation.” New York, USA: UNDP.

———. 2005w. “Democracy in Latin America: Towards a Citizens' Democracy.” New York, USA: UNDP.

UNDP (United Nations Development Programme) and Christian Michelsen Institute. 2005. “Unleashing Capacities to Achieve the MDGs: Summary Note.” Bergen Seminar Series.

UNDP (United Nations Development Programme), and UN ECA (United Nations Economic Commission for Africa). 2002. "Local Governance for Poverty Reduction in Africa – Concept Paper." Maputo, Mozambique: UNDP.

UNEP (United Nations Environment Programme). 2004. "Risk of Water Scarcity: A Business Case for Financial Institutions — Preliminary Findings."

UNFCCC (United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change). 2004. "Progress Report of the Least Developed Countries Expert Group." [FCCC/SBI/2004/17].

UNICEF (United Nations Development Fund for Women). 2005. "Progress of the World's Women 2004: Women, Work and Poverty." New York, USA: UNICEF.

United Nations. 2001a. "Declaration and Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries for the Decade 2001-2010." Resolution 55/279

———. 2001b. "Human Rights, Poverty and Governance in the Least Developed Countries: Right-based Approaches Towards a New Framework of Cooperation; Contributions of the United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights to the Third United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries." [A/CONF.191?BP/8]. New York, USA: UN General Assembly.

———. 2001c. "Governance, Peace and Social Stability." [A/CONF.191/L.1]. New York, USA: UN General Assembly.

———. 2002. "Supporting Africa's Efforts to Achieve Sustainable Development: Dialogues at the Economic and Social Council." New York, USA: UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC).

———. 2003a. "NGOs Assess the Millennium Development Goals." *NGLS Roundup* (105):1-6.

———. 2003b. "Report of the Expert Group Meeting on the Review of the List of Least Developed Countries." New York, USA: United Nations.

———. 2003c. "Question of the Violation of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms in Any Part of the World; Situation of Human Rights in the Sudan; Report of the Special Rapporteur, Gerhart Baum, Submitted in Accordance with the Commission Resolution 2002/16." [E/CN.4/2003/24]. New York, USA: UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC).

———. 2004a. "The Rule of Law and Transitional Justice in Conflict and Post-conflict Societies: Report of the Secretary-General." [S/2004/616]. New York, USA: UN Security Council.

———. 2004b. "Promotion and Protection of Human Rights: The Role of Good Governance in the Promotion of Human Rights." Note by the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. [E/CN.4/2005/97]. New York, USA: UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC).

———. 2004c. "The Situation of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms of Indigenous People." Note by the Secretary-General. [A/59/258]. New York, USA: UN General Assembly.

———. 2004d. "Report of the Secretary-General on the Preliminary Review by the Coordinator of the International Decade of the World's Indigenous Peoples on the Activities of the United Nations System in Relation to the Decade." [E/2004/82]. New York, USA: United Nations.

———. 2004e. "Report of the Workshop on Data Collection and Disaggregation for Indigenous Peoples." [E/C.19/2004/2]. New York, USA: UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC).

———. 2004f. “Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries for the Decade 2001-2010; Report of the Secretary General.” New York, USA: United Nations.

———. 2004g. “Civil and Political Rights, Including the Questions of: Independence of the Judiciary, Administration of Justice, Impunity.” [E/CN.4/2004/60/Add.1]. New York, USA: UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC).

———. 2004h. “Report of the Secretary-General in Response to the Report of the Panel of Eminent Persons on United Nations-Civil Society Relations.” [A/59/359]. New York, USA: UN General Assembly.

———. 2004i. “Supporting Africa’s Efforts to Achieve Sustainable Development: Dialogues at the Economic and Social Council.” New York, USA: UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC).

———. 2004j. “Committee for Development Policy: Report on the Sixth Session (29 March - 2 April 2004).” [E/2004/33, Supplement No. 13]. New York, USA: United Nations.

———. 2004k. “Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and Follow-up to the World Conference on Human Rights: Situation of Human Rights in the Darfur Region of the Sudan.” [E/CN.4/2005/3]. New York, USA: UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC).

———. 2004l. “Resource Mobilization and Enabling Environment for Poverty Eradication in the Context of the Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries for the Decade 2001-2010.” [E/2004/54]. New York, USA: UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC).

———. 2004m. “Sudan: Millennium Development Goals; Interim Unified Report.”

———. 2004n. “Economic, Social and Cultural Rights: Report Submitted by the Independent Expert on Extreme Poverty, Anne-Marie Lizin; Addendum Mission to Yemen.” [E/CN.4/2004/43/Add.1]. New York, USA: UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC).

———. 2005a. “In Larger Freedom: Towards Development, Security and Human Right for All. Report of the Secretary-General.” [A/59/2005]. New York, USA: UN General Assembly.

———. 2005b. “Expert Group on Improving Criteria for the Identification of Least Developed Countries.” [CDP2005/PLEN/18]. New York, USA: United Nations.

———. 2005c. “Organization of the Work of the Session: Report of the Independent Expert on the Situation of Human Rights in the Sudan, Emmanuel Akwei Addo.” [E/CN.4/2005/11]. New York, USA: UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC).

———. 2005d. “Services Consultatifs et Coopération Technique Dans Le Domaine Des Droits de L’Homme: Situation des Droits de L’Homme en Haiti; Rapport Établi par l’Expert Indépendent Louis Joinet.” [E/CN.4/2005/123]. New York, USA: UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC).

———. 2005e. “Background Information: Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries for the Decade 2001-2010, Report of the Secretary-General.” New York, USA: UN General Assembly, UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC).

———. 2005f. “World Public Sector Report 2005: Unlocking the Human Potential for Public Sector Performance.” ST/ESA/PAD/SER.E/63. New York, USA: United Nations.

———. 2005g. "Implementation of the Monterrey Consensus: A Regional Perspective." Note by the Secretary-General. New York, USA: United Nations.

UNODC (United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime). 2003. "The Opium Economy in Afghanistan: An International Problem." New York, USA: UNODC.

———. 2005 a. "Crime and Development in Africa."

———. 2005b. "2005 World Drug Report; Volume 1: Analysis." Vienna, Austria: UNODC.

UNRISD (United Nations Research Institute for Social Development). 2005. "Gender Equality: Striving for Justice in an Unequal World." Geneva, Switzerland: UNRISD.

Valentine, T.R, "Revisiting and Revising Tanzania's Medium Term Pay Reform Strategy: Final Report, prepared for The United Republic of Tanzania, Civil Service Department, Public Service Reform Programme," Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, 2002.

van de Walle, Nicolas. 2002. "Africa's Range of Regimes." *Journal of Democracy* 13(2):66-80.

van der Westhuizen, Carlene. 2004. "Monitoring Provincial Budgets from a Pro-poor Perspective." *Budget Briefs* (139).

Varshney, Ashuosh. 2001. "Ethnic Conflict and Civil Society: India and Beyond." *World Politics* 53(3):362-398.

Verdoolaege, Annelies and Paul Kerstens. 2004. "The South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission and the Belgian Lumumba Commission: A Comparison." *Africa Today* 50(3):75-91.

Wandera, B. 2000. "Tanzania Case Study — Strengthening the Capacity of Water Utilities to Deliver Water Sanitation Services, Environment Health and Hygiene Education to Low Income Urban Communities." Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire: Water Utility Partnership for Capacity Building.

Ward, Jeanne. 2002. "If Not Now, When? Addressing Gender-based Violence in Refugee, Internally Displaced, and Post-conflict Settings." New York, USA: Women's Commission for Refugee Women and Children.

Waszink, Camilla. 2001. "The Proliferation of Small Arms: A Threat to International Human Rights." Geneva, Switzerland: Small Arms Survey.

Weiss, Dieter. 2002. "Summary of Discussions — The Law, Legal Certainty and Empowerment: The Concept of Law within a Cultural Context." Berlin, Germany: Institute of International Economics, Berlin Free University.

White, Geoffrey M. and Lamont Lindstrom. White, Geoffrey M and Lamont Lindstrom, eds. 1997. *Chiefs Today: Traditional Pacific Leadership and the Postcolonial State*. Palo Alto, USA: Stanford University Press.

Widner, Jennifer. 2001. "Courts and Democracy in Postconflict Transitions: A Social Scientist's Perspective on the African Case." *The American Journal of International Law* 95:64-75.

Wimmer, Andreas and Conrad Schetter. 2002. "State Formation First. Recommendations for Reconstruction and Peace-Making in Afghanistan." [ZEF Discussion Papers on Development Policy Number 45]. Bonn, Germany: ZEF Boon (Center for Development Research, Bonn University).

Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars. Hanley, Lisa M., Blair A. Ruble and Joseph S. Tulchin, eds. 2004. *Youth, Poverty, and Conflict in Southeast Asia Cities*. Washington, USA: Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.

Woods, Ngaire. 2002. "Accountability in Global Governance." UNDP Human Development Report Office.

Work, Robertson. 2002. "Overview of Decentralisation Worldwide: A Stepping Stone to Improved Governance and Human Development." Paper for the 2nd International Conference on Decentralisation and Federalism, 25-27 July 2002. Manila, Philippines.

World Bank. 1999. "Yemen: Forging a New Consensus." *Précis* (179):1-5.

———. 2000. "Helping Countries Combat Corruption: Progress at the World Bank since 1997." Washington, USA: World Bank, OCS (Operational Core Services)/PREM (Poverty Reduction and Economic Management (PREM) Network).

———. 2001. "Cambodia: Legal and Judicial Reform Project." [Project ID# KHPE71289]. Washington, USA: World Bank.

World Bank. 2002. Maldives. Public Expenditure Review. Report No. 24238-MV December. online: www-wds.org

———. 2003a. "Implementation Completion Report on the Republic of Yemen Legal and Judicial Development Report." Washington, USA: World Bank.

———. 2003b. "Assessing Sub-national Administration in Afghanistan: Early Observations and Recommendations for Action." Washington, USA: World Bank.

———. 2003c. "Mitigating the Food Crisis in Southern Africa: From Relief to Development." *Findings* (224).

———. 2004a. "Guinea: Strengthening Public Expenditure Management for Poverty Reduction and Growth." [PREM 4/ Report No. 27347-GUI]. Washington, USA: World Bank.

———. 2004b. "World Development Report 2004: Making Services Work for Poor People." Washington, USA: World Bank.

———. 2004c. "Strengthening Public Expenditure Management for Poverty Reduction and Growth." *Public Expenditure Review*.

———. 2005a. "East Asia Decentralizes: Making Local Government Work." Washington, USA: World Bank.

———. 2005b. "Enabling Country Capacity to Achieve Results: 2005 CDF Progress Report." Washington, USA: World Bank.

WUP Africa (Water Utility Partnerships for Capacity Building). 2003. "Better Water and Sanitation for the Urban Poor: Good Practices from Sub-Saharan Africa." Nairobi, Kenya: European Communities and Water Utility Partnership.

Yoder, John C. 2003. *Popular Political Culture, Civil Society, and State Crisis in Liberia*. Lewiston, USA: Edwin Mellen Press.

Yoon, Chin Saik. 2004. "Digital Review of Asia Pacific 2003/2004." Montreal Canada: International Network of UNESCO Chairs in Communications (ORBICOM), International Development Research Centre (IDRC), UNDP Asia-Pacific Development Programme.

Zafarullah, Habib and Mohammad Habibur Rahman. 2002. "Human Rights, Civil Society and Nongovernmental Organizations: The Nexus in Bangladesh." *Human Rights Quarterly* (24):1011-1034.

Zafarullah, Habib, Mohammad Mohabbat Khan and Mohammad Habibur Rahman. 2005. "Civil Service Systems, Bangladesh." Paper prepared for the Comparative Civil Service Research Consortium's conference Civil Service Systems in Comparative Perspective, Indiana University, April 5 - 8, 1997, p. 13., Bloomington, USA: Indiana University, http://www.indiana.edu/~csrc/zafar1.html.

Zeleza, Paul T. and Phillip J. McConnaughay. Zeleza, Paul T. and Phillip J. McConnaughay, eds. 2004. *Human Rights, the Rule of Law and Development in Africa*. Philadelphia, USA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Ziegler, Melissa and Rachel Neilds. 2002. "From Peace to Governance: Police Reform and International Community." Washington, DC: WOLA (Washington Office for Latin America).

Zuckerman, Adrian A. S. 2000. "Reforming Civil Justice Systems: Trends in Industrial Countries." *The World Bank PREM Notes* (46).

Zvekic, Ugljesa. 1998. "Policing and Attitudes towards Police in Countries in Transition: Preliminary Results of the International Crime (Victim) Survey." *Policing and Society* 8:205-224.

# Statistical Annex

# Introduction and overview

The core parts of the statistical annex are 50 country profiles and 11 tables that include indicators accessed in the last quarter of 2005. The profiles and tables cover key development characteristics that relate to societies' governance, including well-being, as well as their economic and environmental situations. The profiles and tables are meant to complement each other; together, they illustrate LDCs' numerous successes and challenges from the perspective of the BPoA and the MDGs.

Indicators were selected using several criteria, including coverage over time and across LDCs; source objectivity and impartiality; and relevance to the Report's overall focus. A final factor considered was the availability and accessibility of data.

Though not restricted to them, the main sources of indicators are the 2005 *Human Development Report*, the *Millennium Indicator Database* maintained by the United Nations Statistics Divisions, and the 2005 edition of *World Development Indicators*.

Since effort has been made to highlight trends, sources that provide information over relatively long periods of time were given greater priority than those that do not. As result, two estimates at different points in time are given where data are available. This shows whether there has been improvement, deterioration or stagnation for any given indicator. Two dots (..) indicate where no reliable published and available estimates were found.

The US GDP deflator was used to provide comparisons over time for indicators, such as aid and external debt per capita, where figures were given originally in current $. This implies that the indicators are adjusted to inflation in the United States, and therefore the movements observed are real variations.

Finally, it should be noted that indicators for different countries may come from different sources; accordingly, cross-country comparisons are not always advisable. Additional information about specific sources may be found below in the sections on indicator sources and aggregations.

# On governance

All data included in the tables and country profiles can, in one way or another, be considered to be indicators of national and, when feasible, international governance. However, at the same time the Report includes explicit governance indicators, which were developed for the sole purpose of gauging governance. They include the number of political parties currently holding seats in the parliament, the most recent election held, and aggregate perception indicators of governance, among others.

It should be noted that analyses based on a single governance indicator always contain a high margin of error. Therefore, it is advisable to simultaneously consider several of the selected indicators in this publication before drawing conclusions on the governance achievements and challenges of LDCs. Furthermore, readers are urged to view the selected governance indicators as evidence that supports the qualitative analysis found in the main text.

# On notation

All country profiles follow the same thematic structure and systems for headings and dating. Moreover, each country has its own references for outliers.[288] Depending on the estimates in question, time referencing is done in three different ways in the profiles and tables. The first (a) is the main reference; it appears at the top of the indicators list and usually applies to two different time periods (usually 1995 and 2002-2004). The second (b) is used when indicator dates do not match those in (a). In this case, alphabetical footnoting is included in a column to the right of the slot where the irregular date lies. The third (c) is noted in a column to the left of the estimate and is exclusively for indicators with no trends — that is, for single point estimates in time.

A dash ( - ) between two years (such as 1995-1999) at the top of columns means that the most recent estimate for that period was selected. The use of a slash ( / ) between two years (such as 1998/1999) implies a schooling cycle or a simple arithmetic average over the period.

In the table on international treaties, a filled dot ( • ) means that there was ratification, accession or succession; a blank dot ( _ ) means that the treaty had been signed but not ratified at the time the data were collected.

# On aggregation

In general, aggregates[289] published in the tables and country profiles are averages weighted by total population or total live births based on the 2005 *Human Development Report*. For some indicators — surface in sq km, total population, refugees and people affected by natural disasters — totals are employed instead of weighted averages. Totals are marked with the capital letter T.

Aggregation formulas and methods similar to the one deployed in the 2005 *Human Development Report* are used for this Report's in-house estimates. The two necessary conditions in such situations are that at least half the countries of any group must be represented and that at least two thirds of the weight of any group must be accounted for. If either of these conditions is not met, the aggregate is not calculated for the group.

The year of the aggregate is the one that is listed in the respective column. For aggregate trends, countries with no data in at least one of the periods are not included. Unless otherwise specified in the indicator sources section below, any aggregate for any year uses only one source of data. These conditions guarantee aggregate comparability in time and across countries.

It should be noted, finally, that aggregates published in this Report may differ from those found in other documents and reports. There are two reasons for this: country groupings are dynamic in time — continuously changing as countries move in and out of groups — and calculation methodology differs because the necessary conditions for aggregation can be made more or less stringent depending on the desired level of accuracy.

[288] For the statistics in this Report, an outlier is defined as an estimate that lies outside the range of a pre-specified time horizon. If, for example, data are being collected for the year 2000, then a country where the most recent estimate is from 1995 is considered an outlier.

[289] The aggregates used are world, least developed countries, developing countries, low income, low human development, medium human development, middle income, high human development, high income, and high income OECD. For more on these aggregates see UNDP (2005a), UN-OHRLLS (2005), and World Bank (2005a).

**TABLE 1**

# LDCs — basic features

| Countries | Surface (sq km) | in millions 2004 | Annual population growth rate (%) 2003/2015 | Parliamentary structure | Capital |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Afghanistan | 652,090 | 28.5 | .. | Bicameral | Kabul |
| Angola | 1,246,700 | 14.0 | 2.8% | Unicameral | Luanda |
| Bangladesh | 144,000 | 140.5 | 1.7% | Unicameral | Dhaka |
| Benin | 112,620 | 6.9 | 2.9% | Unicameral | Porto-Novo/Cotonou |
| Bhutan | 47,000 | 0.9 | 2.2% | Unicameral | Thimphu |
| Burkina Faso | 274,000 | 12.4 | 2.9% | Unicameral | Ouagadougou |
| Burundi | 27,830 | 7.3 | 3.4% | Bicameral | Bujumbura |
| Cambodia | 181,040 | 13.6 | 1.9% | Bicameral | Phnom Penh |
| Cape Verde | 4,030 | 0.5 | 2.2% | Unicameral | Praia |
| Central African Republic | 622,980 | 3.9 | 1.4% | Unicameral | Bangui |
| Chad | 1,284,000 | 8.8 | 2.8% | Unicameral | N'Djamena |
| Comoros | 2,230 | 0.6 | 2.5% | Unicameral | Moroni |
| Democratic Republic of the Congo | 2,344,860 | 54.8 | 3.0% | Bicameral | Kinshasa |
| Djibouti | 23,200 | 0.7 | 1.6% | Unicameral | Djibouti |
| Equatorial Guinea | 28,050 | 0.5 | 2.2% | Unicameral | Malabo |
| Eritrea | 117,600 | 4.5 | 3.0% | Unicameral | Asmara |
| Ethiopia | 1,104,300 | 70.0 | 2.3% | Bicameral | Addis Ababa |
| Gambia | 11,300 | 1.4 | 2.3% | Unicameral | Banjul |
| Guinea | 245,860 | 8.1 | 2.3% | Unicameral | Conakry |
| Guinea-Bissau | 36,120 | 1.5 | 3.0% | Unicameral | Bissau |
| Haiti | 27,750 | 8.6 | 1.4% | Bicameral | Port-au-Prince |
| Kiribati | 730 | 0.1 | .. | Unicameral | Tarawa |
| Lao People´s Democratic Republic | 236,800 | 5.8 | 2.1% | Unicameral | Vientiane |
| Lesotho | 30,350 | 1.8 | -0.3% | Bicameral | Maseru |
| Liberia | 111,370 | 3.4 | .. | Unicameral | Monrovia |
| Madagascar | 587,040 | 17.3 | 2.5% | Bicameral | Antananarivo |
| Malawi | 118,480 | 11.2 | 2.2% | Unicameral | Lilongwe |
| Maldives | 300 | 0.3 | 2.4% | Unicameral | Male |
| Mali | 1,240,190 | 11.9 | 2.9% | Unicameral | Bamako |
| Mauritania | 1,025,520 | 2.9 | 2.7% | .. | Nouakchott |
| Mozambique | 801,590 | 19.1 | 1.8% | Unicameral | Maputo |
| Myanmar | 676,580 | 49.9 | 0.9% | .. | Yangon (Rangoon) |
| Nepal | 147,180 | 25.2 | 1.9% | Bicameral | Kathmandu |
| Niger | 1,267,000 | 12.1 | 3.3% | Unicameral | Niamey |
| Rwanda | 26,340 | 8.4 | 2.1% | Bicameral | Kigali |
| Samoa | 2,840 | 0.2 | 0.3% | Unicameral | Apia |
| São Tomé and Principe | 960 | 0.2 | 2.1% | Unicameral | São Tomé |
| Senegal | 196,720 | 10.5 | 2.2% | Unicameral | Dakar |
| Sierra Leone | 71,740 | 5.4 | 2.5% | Unicameral | Freetown |
| Solomon Islands | 28,900 | 0.5 | 2.3% | Unicameral | Honiara |
| Somalia | 637,660 | 9.9 | .. | Unicameral | Mogadishu |
| Sudan | 2,505,810 | 34.4 | 1.9% | Unicameral | Khartoum |

CONTINUES

| Countries | Surface (sq km) | In millions 2004 | Population growth rate (%) 2003/2015 | Annual population Parliamentary structure | Capital | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Timor-Leste | 14,870 | 0.9 | 4.9% | Unicameral | Dili | | |
| Togo | 56,790 | 5.0 | 2.5% | Unicameral | Lomé | | |
| Tuvalu | 26 | 0.0 | .. | Unicameral | Funafuti (Fongafale) | | |
| Uganda | 241,040 | 25.9 | 3.7% | Unicameral | Kampala | | |
| United Republic of Tanzania | 945,090 | 36.6 | 1.8% | Unicameral | Dodoma | | |
| Vanuatu | 12,190 | 0.2 | 1.8% | Unicameral | Port-Villa | | |
| Yemen | 527,970 | 19.8 | 3.1% | Bicameral | San'a' (Sanaa) | | |
| Zambia | 752,610 | 10.5 | 1.7% | Unicameral | Lusaka | | |
| World | 133,458,177 | T | 6286.7 | T | 1.1% | .. | .. |
| Least developed countries | 20,802,220 | T | 689.0 | T | 2.3% | .. | .. |
| Developing countries | 78,282,355 | T | 5006.2 | T | 1.3% | .. | .. |
| Low income | 31,551,440 | T | 2323.0 | T | 1.6% | .. | .. |
| Low human development | 17,389,160 | T | 577.4 | T | 2.3% | .. | .. |
| Medium human development | 75,226,130 | T | 4425.5 | T | 1.0% | .. | .. |
| Middle income | 69,920,895 | T | 3014.8 | T | 0.8% | .. | .. |
| High human development | 38777973 | T | 1213.8 | T | 0.5% | .. | .. |
| High income | 32,432,681 | T | 954.8 | T | 0.5% | .. | .. |
| High income OECD | 31,799,316 | T | 919.0 | T | 0.5% | .. | .. |

*Sources: Columns 1-2 World Bank (2005a) UN-OHRLLS (2005); column 3 UNDP (2005a); column 4 IPU (2005a); column 5 UN-OHRLLS (2005).*

**TABLE 2**

# LDCs – status of human development (key indicators)

■ = MDG

| Countries | Life expectancy (years, male and female combined) 1990 | 2003 | Adult literacy rate (% of people ages 15 and above) 2000-2004 | Combined gross enrolments ratio for primary, secondary and tertiary schools 2002/3 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Afghanistan | 41.5 | 42.0 | .. | 39.4% |
| Angola | 45.5 | 46.7 | 66.8% | 30.0% (b) |
| Bangladesh | 54.8 | 62.4 | 41.1% | 53.0% |
| Benin | 51.9 | 53.0 | 33.6% | 55.0% |
| Bhutan | 57.7 (a) | 63.5 | .. | 49.0% (d) |
| Burkina Faso | 45.4 | 42.8 | 12.8% (b) | 24.0% |
| Burundi | 43.6 | 41.6 | 58.9% | 35.0% |
| Cambodia | 50.3 | 54.0 | 73.6% | 59.0% |
| Cape Verde | 65.3 | 69.2 | 75.7% | 73.0% |
| Central African Republic | 47.6 | 41.8 | 48.6% | 31.0% |
| Chad | 46.2 | 48.3 | 25.5% | 38.0% |
| Comoros | 56.0 | 61.6 | 56.2% | 47.0% |
| Democratic Republic of the Congo | 51.5 | 45.2 | 65.3% | 28.0% (b) |
| Djibouti | 47.8 | 43.0 | .. | 24.0% |
| Equatorial Guinea | 47.2 | 52.2 | 84.2% | 65.0% |
| Eritrea | 48.9 | 51.1 | .. | 35.0% |
| Ethiopia | 45.0 | 42.0 | 41.5% | 36.0% |
| Gambia | 49.3 | 53.4 | .. | 48.0% |
| Guinea | 43.7 | 46.2 | .. | 41.0% |
| Guinea-Bissau | 42.4 | 45.5 | .. | 37.0% (b) |
| Haiti | 53.1 | 51.9 | 51.9% | 48.0% (d) |
| Kiribati | 56.8 | 63.1 | .. | 84.9% |
| Lao People´s Democratic Republic | 49.7 | 54.7 | 68.7% | 61.0% |
| Lesotho | 57.6 | 37.2 | 81.4% | 66.0% |
| Liberia | 45.1 | 47.1 | 55.9% | 61.0% |
| Madagascar | 52.8 | 55.7 | 70.6% | 51.0% |
| Malawi | 44.6 | 37.5 | 64.1% (b) | 72.0% |
| Maldives | 61.7 | 69.5 | 96.3% | 75.0% |
| Mali | 45.0 | 40.6 | 19.0% (b) | 32.0% |
| Mauritania | 49.1 | 51.0 | 51.2% | 45.0% |
| Mozambique | 43.4 | 40.7 | 46.5% | 43.0% |
| Myanmar | 54.7 | 57.3 | 89.7% | 48.0% |
| Nepal | 53.6 | 60.2 | 48.6% | 61.0% |
| Niger | 42.1 | 46.4 | 14.4% | 21.0% |
| Rwanda | 40.2 | 39.8 | 64.0% | 55.0% |
| Samoa | 66.3 | 69.5 | 98.7% | 71.0% |
| São Tomé and Principe | 62.2 | 66.0 | .. | 62.0% (b) |
| Senegal | 49.5 | 52.3 | 39.3% | 40.0% |
| Sierra Leone | 35.2 | 37.4 | 29.6% | 45.0% (b) |
| Solomon Islands | 64.5 | 69.5 | .. | 52.0% |
| Somalia | 41.6 | 47.4 | .. | .. |
| Sudan | 52.2 | 58.6 | 59.0% | 38.0% |
| Timor-Leste | .. | 62.2 | .. | 75.0% (b) |
| Togo | 50.5 | 49.7 | 53.0% | 66.0% |
| Tuvalu | .. | 61.0 | .. | 68.7% |
| Uganda | 46.8 | 43.2 | 68.9% | 74.0% |
| United Republic of Tanzania | 50.1 | 42.7 | 69.4% | 41.0% |

CONTINUES

| ■ Children reaching grade 5 (% of grade 1 students) | | ■ Fixed line and mobile subscribers (per 1,000) | | Internet users (per 1,000) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1990/1991 | 2001/2002 | 1995 | 2002-2003 | 1997 | 2002-2003 |
| .. | .. | 1.5 | 11.8 | .. | 1.0 |
| .. | .. | 5.1 | 15.4 | 0.1 | 2.9 |
| .. | 54% | 2.4 | 15.6 | 0.0 | 1.8 |
| 55% | 68% | 5.4 | 43.1 | 0.3 | 10.0 |
| .. | 91% (e) | 9.0 | 45.2 | 1.1 (i) | 20.4 |
| 70% | 66% | 3.0 | 23.9 | 0.2 | 3.9 |
| 62% | 68% | 2.9 | 12.3 | 0.1 | 2.0 |
| .. | 61% | 2.2 | 37.8 | 0.1 | 2.5 |
| .. | 88% | 55.7 | 272.6 | 2.5 | 43.6 |
| 24% | .. | 2.5 | 5.5 | 0.1 | 1.4 |
| 53% | 60% (e) | 0.8 | 5.8 | 0.0 | 1.9 |
| .. | 72% (f) | 7.2 | 19.1 | 0.0 | 6.3 |
| 55% | .. | 1.0 | 10.8 | 0.0 | 0.1 (k) |
| | | | | | |
| 87% | 80% | 13.1 | 49.7 | 0.9 | 9.7 |
| .. | 29% (e) | 6.3 | 94.1 | 0.5 | 1.5 (k) |
| .. | 86% | 4.9 | 9.0 | 0.1 | 7.2 |
| .. | 62% | 2.5 | 7.7 | 0.0 | 1.1 |
| .. | .. | 18.9 | 100.8 | 0.5 | 9.2 (k) |
| 59% | .. | 1.7 | 17.8 | 0.0 | 5.2 |
| .. | 38% (g) | 6.9 | 9.2 | 0.2 | 14.8 |
| .. | .. | 8.4 | 55.2 | 0.3 (j) | 18.0 |
| .. | .. | 26.1 | 57.3 | 6.1 (j) | 22.8 |
| .. | 64% | 3.9 | 32.0 | 0.1 (j) | 1.1 (k) |
| | | | | | |
| 71% | 73% | 8.8 | 55.7 | 0.0 | 9.7 |
| .. | .. | 1.6 | 2.8 (h) | 0.0 | 0.3 (l) |
| 22% | 53% | 3.0 | 21.0 | 0.1 | 4.3 |
| 64% | 44% | 3.7 | 21.0 | 0.1 | 3.4 |
| .. | .. | 56.7 | 251.1 | 3.1 | 53.4 |
| 73% | 75% | 1.9 | 10.3 | 0.1 | 2.4 |
| 75% | 61% | 4.1 | 141.4 | 0.0 | 4.4 |
| 33% | 49% | 4.0 | 18.6 | 0.1 | 2.8 |
| .. | 65% | 3.6 | 8.1 | 0.0 (k) | 0.5 |
| .. | 65% | 4.1 | 17.8 | 0.2 | 3.4 |
| 62% | 69% | 1.5 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 1.3 |
| 60% | 47% | 1.3 | 16.4 | 0.0 | 3.1 |
| .. | 94% (e) | 46.4 | 130.5 | 1.7 | 5.7 (k) |
| .. | 61% (e) | 19.7 | 77.6 | 2.8 (j) | 98.7 |
| 85% | 80% | 9.8 | 77.7 | 0.3 | 21.7 |
| .. | .. | 3.7 | 18.2 | 0.0 | 1.6 |
| 85% | .. | 18.4 | 16.2 | 3.9 | 5.2 |
| .. | .. | 1.7 | 13.3 | 0.0 | 9.0 |
| 94% | 84% | 2.8 | 46.6 | 0.0 | 9.0 |
| .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| 51% | 69% | 5.2 | 56.1 | 2.3 | 42.0 |
| .. .. | | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| .. | 64% | 2.1 | 32.7 | 0.1 | 4.9 |
| 79% | 88% | 3.3 | 29.5 | 0.1 | 7.1 |

**TABLE 2 -** CONTINUED

# LDCs – status of human development (key indicators)

■ = MDG

| Countries | Life expectancy (years, male and female combined) 1990 | 2003 | Adult literacy rate (% of people ages 15 and above) 2000-2004 | Combined gross enrolments ratio for primary, secondary and tertiary schools 2002/3 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Vanuatu | 64.5 | 68.7 | 74.0% (b) | 58.0% |
| Yemen | 52.2 | 57.7 | 49.0% | 55.0% |
| Zambia | 49.1 | 36.5 | 67.9% (b) | 48.0% |
| World | 65.3 | 66.8 | 76.9% (c) | 67.0% |
| Least developed countries | 50.1 | 51.1 | 53.5% (c) | 45.0% |
| Developing countries | 62.6 | 64.6 | 75.2% (c) | 63.0% |
| Low income | 56.3 | 58.3 | 60.5% (c) | 54.0% |
| Low human development | 48.6 | 45.1 | 56.5% (c) | 46.0% |
| Medium human development | 64.3 | 66.8 | 78.5% (c) | 66.0% |
| Middle income | 67.8 | 69.7 | 89.3% (c) | 73.0% |
| High human development | 75.0 | 77.6 | .. | 91.0% |
| High income | 76.0 | 78.5 | .. | 94.0% |
| High income OECD | 76.0 | 78.5 | .. | 95.0% |

Notes: (a) 1992; (b) year other than specified; (c) aggregate uses average population for given period; some estimates from year other than specified; (d) UNDP (2005a) estimate; (e) 2000/2001 school cycle; (f) 1999/2000 school cycle; (g) 1989/1999 school cycle; (h) 2001; (i) 1999; (j) 1998; (k) 2000; (l) 2001.

*Sources: Columns 1-2 World Bank (2005a) and WHO (2005a); column 3 UNESCO (2005) and World Bank (2005a); columns 4-6 UNDP (2005a); columns 7-10 World Bank (2005a).*

**TABLE 3**

# LDCs — profile of human deprivation (key indicators)

■ = MDG

| Countries | Poverty (% of population) ■ Living on less than $1 a day (PPP) 1991-2001 | Poverty rate at national poverty line 1990-2004 | Income or consumption share of richest 20% 1993-2001 | ■ Income or consumption share of poorest 20% | National Gini index |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Afghanistan | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| Angola | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| Bangladesh | 36.0% | 49.8% | 41.3% | 9.0% | 31.8 |
| Benin | .. | 29.0% | .. | .. | .. |
| Bhutan | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| Burkina Faso | 44.9% | 45.3% | 60.7% | 4.5% | 46.7 |
| Burundi | 54.6% | 36.4% | 48.0% | 5.1% | 42.4 |
| Cambodia | 34.1% | 35.9% | 47.6% | 6.9% | .. |
| Cape Verde | .. | .. | .. | .. | 40.4 |
| Central African Republic | 66.6% | .. | 65.0% | 2.0% | 61.3 |
| Chad | .. | 64.0% | .. | .. | .. |
| Comoros | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| Democratic Republic of the Congo | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| Djibouti | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| Equatorial Guinea | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| Eritrea | 23.0% | 53.0% | .. | .. | .. |
| Ethiopia | .. | 44.2% | 39.4% | 9.1% | 30.0 |
| Gambia | 53.7% | 57.6% | 53.4% | 4.8% | 47.5 |
| Guinea | .. | 40.0% | 47.2% | 6.4% | 40.3 |
| Guinea-Bissau | .. | .. | 53.4% | 5.2% | 47.0 |

CONTINUES

| ■ Children reaching grade 5 (% of grade 1 students) | | ■ Fixed line and mobile subscribers (per 1,000) | | Internet users (per 1,000) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1990/1991 | 2001/2002 | 1995 | 2002-2003 | 1997 | 2002-2003 |
| .. | 72% (f) | 25.9 | 69.0 | 1.4 | 36.1 |
| .. | 76% | 12.7 | 48.9 | 0.2 | 0.8 (k) |
| .. | 81% (f) | 8.8 | 29.4 | 0.1 | 6.1 |
| .. | .. | 137.5 | 402.0 | 21.4 | 116.7 |
| .. | .. | 3.4 | 21.8 | 0.1 | 4.3 |
| .. | .. | 42.6 | 243.2 | 2.3 | 51.6 |
| .. | .. | 11.0 | 52.9 | 0.5 | 13.9 |
| .. | .. | 4.4 | 29.5 | 0.1 | 5.7 |
| | .. | 45.7 | 254.7 | 1.6 | 45.8 |
| .. | .. | 73.1 | 392.8 | 3.0 | 74.2 |
| .. | .. | 516.3 | 1131.4 | 95.6 | 407.6 |
| .. | .. | 611.1 | 1268.6 | 117.0 | 467.8 |
| .. | .. | 614.8 | 1268.1 | 118.9 | 472.6 |

| Children under five years old who are short for their age (% of under age 5) | ■ Children under five years old who are underweight for their age (% of under age 5) | People living with HIV/AIDS (adults % of age 15-49) | | ■ Maternal mortality ratio adjusted (per 100,000 live births) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1995-2003 | 1995-2003 | 2001 | 2003 | 1995 | 2000 |
| 48% | 49% | .. | .. | 820 | 1900 |
| 45% | 31% | 3.7% | 3.9% | 1300 | 1700 |
| 42% | 48% | .. | .. | 600 | 380 |
| 31% | 23% | 1.9% | 1.9% | 880 | 850 |
| 40% | 19% | .. | .. | 500 | 420 |
| 39% | 38% | 4.2% | 1.8% | 1400 | 1000 |
| 57% | 45% | 6.2% | 6.0% | 1900 | 1000 |
| 45% | 45% | 2.7% | 2.6% | 590 | 450 |
| .. | .. | .. | .. | 190 | 150 |
| 28% | 23% | 13.5% | 13.5% | 1200 | 1100 |
| 29% | 28% | 4.9% | 4.8% | 1500 | 1100 |
| 42% | 25% | .. | .. | 570 | 480 |
| 38% | 31% | 4.2% | 4.2% | 940 | 990 |
| 26% | 18% | 2.8% | 2.9% | 520 | 730 |
| .. | 0% | .. | .. | 1400 | 880 |
| 38% | 40% | 2.8% | 2.7% | 1100 | 630 |
| 52% | 47% | 4.1% | 4.4% | 1800 | 850 |
| 19% | 17% | 1.2% | 1.2% | 1100 | 540 |
| 26% | 23% | 2.8% | 3.2% | 1200 | 740 |
| 31% | 25% | .. | .. | 910 | 1100 |

**TABLE 3 -** CONTINUED

# LDCs — profile of human deprivation (key indicators)

■ = MDG

| Countries | Poverty (% of population) ■ Living on less than $1 a day (PPP) 1991-2001 | Poverty (% of population) Poverty rate at national poverty line 1990-2004 | Income or consumption share of richest 20% 1993-2001 | ■ Income or consumption share of poorest 20% | National Gini index |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Haiti | 0.7% | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| Kiribati | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| Lao People´s Democratic Republic | 26.3% | 38.6% | 45.0% | 7.6% | 37.0 |
| Lesotho | 36.4% | .. | 66.5% | 1.5% | 63.2 |
| Liberia | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| Madagascar | 61.0% | 71.3% | 53.5% | 4.9% | 47.5 |
| Malawi | 41.7% | 65.3% | 56.1% | 4.9% | 50.3 |
| Maldives | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| Mali | 72.3% | 63.8% | 56.2% | 4.6% | 50.5 |
| Mauritania | 25.9% | 46.3% | 45.7% | 6.2% | 39.0 |
| Mozambique | 37.9% | 69.4% | 46.5% | 6.5% | 39.6 |
| Myanmar | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| Nepal | 39.1% | 42.0% | 44.8% | 7.6% | 36.7 |
| Niger | 60.6% | 63.0% | 53.3% | 2.6% | 50.5 |
| Rwanda | 51.7% | 60.3% | .. | .. | .. |
| Samoa | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| São Tomé and Principe | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| Senegal | 22.3% | 33.4% | 48.2% | 6.4% | 41.3 |
| Sierra Leone | .. | 0.7% | .. | .. | 62.9(a) |
| Solomon Islands | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| Somalia | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| Sudan | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| Timor-Leste | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| Togo | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| Tuvalu | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| Uganda | .. | 44.0% | 49.7% | 5.9% | 43.0 |
| United Republic of Tanzania | 48.5% | 35.7% | 44.2% | 6.9% | 36.7 |
| Vanuatu | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| Yemen | 15.7% | 41.8% | 41.2% | 7.4% | 33.4 |
| Zambia | 63.7% | 72.9% | 56.6% | 3.3% | 52.6 |
| World | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| Least developed countries | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| Developing countries | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| Low income | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| Low human development | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| Medium human development | | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| Middle income | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| High human development | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| High income | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| High income OECD | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |

Notes: (a) 1989.

*Sources: Columns 1-2 and 8-9 World Bank (2005a); columns 3-5 World Bank (2005a) and WIDER (2005); columns 6-7 WHO (2005b); columns 10-11 UN (2005) and World Bank (2005a).*

| Children under five years old who are short for their age (% of under age 5) 1995-2003 | ■ Children under five years old who are underweight for their age (% of under age 5) 1995-2003 | People living with HIV/AIDS (adults % of age 15-49) 2001 | 2003 | ■ Maternal mortality ratio adjusted (per 100,000 live births) 1995 | 2000 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 23% | 17% | 5.5% | 5.6% | 1100 | 680 |
| .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| 42% | 40% | 0.1% | 0.1% | 650 | 650 |
| | | | | | |
| 46% | 18% | 29.6% | 28.9% | 530 | 550 |
| 40% | 27% | 5.1% | 5.9% | 1000 | 760 |
| 48% | 40% | 1.3% | 1.7% | 580 | 550 |
| 49% | 25% | 14.3% | 14.2% | 580 | 1800 |
| 25% | 30% | .. | .. | 390 | 110 |
| 38% | 33% | 1.7% | 1.9% | 630 | 1200 |
| 35% | 32% | 0.5% | 0.6% | 870 | 1000 |
| 36% | 26% | 12.1% | 12.2% | 980 | 1000 |
| 32% | 32% | 1.0% | 1.2% | 170 | 360 |
| 51% | 48% | 0.4% | 0.5% | 830 | 740 |
| 40% | 40% | 1.1% | 1.2% | 920 | 1600 |
| 43% | 24% | 5.1% | 5.1% | 2300 | 1400 |
| 4% | 2% | .. | .. | 15 | 130 |
| 29% | 13% | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| | | | | | |
| 25% | 23% | 0.8% | 0.8% | 1200 | 690 |
| 34% | 27% | .. | .. | 2100 | 2000 |
| .. | .. | .. | .. | 60 | 130 |
| 23% | 26% | .. | .. | 1600 | 1100 |
| 43% | 41% | 1.9% | 2.3% | 1500 | 590 |
| 49% | 46% | .. | .. | 850 | 660 |
| 22% | 25% | 4.3% | 4.1% | 980 | 570 |
| .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| 39% | 23% | 5.1% | 4.1% | 1100 | 880 |
| 44% | 29% | 9.0% | 8.8% | 1100 | 1500 |
| 20% | 12% | .. | .. | 32 | 130 |
| 52% | 46% | .. | 0.1% | 850 | 570 |
| 47% | 28% | 16.7% | 15.6% | 870 | 750 |
| | | | | | |
| .. | .. | 1.2% | 1.2% | .. | .. |
| .. | .. | 4.5% | 4.4% | .. | .. |
| .. | .. | 1.4% | 1.4% | .. | .. |
| .. | .. | 2.3% | 2.3% | .. | .. |
| .. | .. | 5.9% | 5.7% | .. | .. |
| .. | .. | .. | 0.8% | 0.8% | .. .. |
| .. | .. | 0.7% | 0.6% | .. | .. |
| .. | .. | 0.4% | 0.4% | .. | .. |
| .. | .. | 0.3% | 0.4% | .. | .. |
| .. | .. | 0.4% | 0.4% | .. | .. |

**TABLE 4**

# LDCs — access to basic social services

■ = MDG

| Countries | ■ School enrolment (% net) Primary 1999/2000 | 2002/2003 | ■ Proportion of population with access to improved sanitation 1990 | 2002 | ■ Proportion of population with sustainable access to an improved water source 1990 | 2002 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Afghanistan | .. | .. | .. | 8% | .. | 13% |
| Angola | 61% (a) | .. | 30% | 30% | 32% | 50% |
| Bangladesh | 89% | 84% | 23% | 48% | 71% | 75% |
| Benin | 58% | .. | 11% | 32% | 60% | 68% |
| Bhutan | .. | .. | .. | 70% | .. | 62% |
| Burkina Faso | 34% | 36% | 13% | 12% | 39% | 51% |
| Burundi | 45% | 57% | 44% | 36% | 69% | 79% |
| Cambodia | 88% | 93% | .. | 16% | .. | 34% |
| Cape Verde | 100% | 99% | .. | 42% | .. | 80% |
| Central African Republic | .. | .. | 23% | 27% | 48% | 75% |
| Chad | 57% | 63% | 6% | 8% | 20% | 34% |
| Comoros | 55% | .. | 23% | 23% | 89% | 94% |
| Democratic Republic of the Congo | .. | .. | 18% | 29% | 43% | 46% |
| Djibouti | 30% | 34% (b) | 48% | 50% | 78% | 80% |
| Equatorial Guinea | 84% | 85% (b) | .. | 53% | .. | 44% |
| Eritrea | 38% | 45% | 8% | 9% | 40% | 57% |
| Ethiopia | 40% | 47% | 4% | 6% | 25% | 22% |
| Gambia | 67% | 79% | .. | 53% | .. | 82% |
| Guinea | 49% | 65% | 17% | 13% | 42% | 51% |
| Guinea-Bissau | 45% | 45% (c) | .. | 34% | .. | 59% |
| Haiti | .. | .. | 15% | 34% | 53% | 71% |
| Kiribati | .. | .. | 25% | 39% | 48% | 64% |
| Lao People´s Democratic Republic | 82% | 85% | .. | 24% | .. | 43% |
| Lesotho | 61% | 86% | 37% | 37% | .. | 76% |
| Liberia | 70% | .. | 38% | 26% | 56% | 62% |
| Madagascar | 66% | 79% | 12% | 33% | 40% | 45% |
| Malawi | 100% | .. | 36% | 46% | 41% | 67% |
| Maldives | 100% | 92% | .. | 58% | 99% | 84% |
| Mali | 38% (a) | 44% | 36% | 45% | 34% | 48% |
| Mauritania | 63% (a) | 68% | 28% | 42% | 41% | 56% |
| Mozambique | 50% | 55% | .. | 27% | .. | 42% |
| Myanmar | 84% | 84% | 21% | 73% | 48% | 80% |
| Nepal | 70% | 70% (c) | 12% | 27% | 69% | 84% |
| Niger | 27% | 38% | 7% | 12% | 40% | 46% |
| Rwanda | .. | 87% | 37% | 41% | 58% | 73% |
| Samoa | 92% | 98% | 98% | 100% | 91% | 88% |
| São Tomé and Principe | 85% (a) | 97% (b) | .. | 24% | .. | 79% |
| Senegal | 61% | 58% | 35% | 52% | 66% | 72% |
| Sierra Leone | .. | .. | .. | 39% | .. | 57% |
| Solomon Islands | .. | 72% | .. | 31% | .. | 70% |
| Somalia | .. | .. | .. | 25% | .. | 29% |
| Sudan | 46% | .. | 33% | 34% | 64% | 69% |
| Timor-Leste | .. | .. | .. | 33% | .. | 52% |
| Togo | 91% | 91% | 37% | 34% | 49% | 51% |
| Tuvalu | .. | .. | 78% | 88% | 91% | 93% |
| Uganda | .. | .. | 43% | 41% | 44% | 56% |
| United Republic of Tanzania | 46% | 69% | 47% | 46% | 38% | 73% |
| Vanuatu | 89% | 94% | .. | .. | 60% | 60% |
| Yemen | 60% | 72% | 21% | 30% | 69% | 69% |
| Zambia | 67% | 68% | 41% | 45% | 50% | 55% |

| Physicians (per 1,000) | | Public expenditure on Health (% of GDP) | | Education (% of GDP) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1993/1998 | 2004 | 1998 | 2002 | 1998/1999 | 2002/2003 |
| 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.5% | 3.1% | .. | .. |
| 0.1 | 0.1 | 1.0% | 2.1% | 2.6% | 2.8% (c) |
| 0.2 | 0.2 | 1.0% | 0.8% | 2.4% | 2.4% |
| 0.1 | 0.1 | 1.8% | 2.1% | 2.5% | 3.3% |
| 0.2 | 0.1 | 3.4% | 4.1% | 5.2% (g) | 5.2% (b) |
| 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.7% | 2.0% | .. | .. |
| 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.6% | 0.6% | 3.9% | 3.9% |
| 0.1 | 0.1 | 1.1% | 2.1% | 1.3% | 1.8% |
| 0.2 | 0.2 | 3.8% | 3.8% | 4.4% | 7.9% |
| 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.2% | 1.6% | 1.9% | .. |
| 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.7% | 2.7% | 1.7% | 2.0% (g) |
| 0.1 | 0.1 | 2.2% | 1.7% | 3.8% | 3.9% |
| 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2% | 1.1% | .. | .. |
| | | | | | |
| 0.1 | 0.1 | 3.3% | 3.3% | 3.5% | .. |
| 0.2 | 0.2 | 2.5% | 1.3% | 1.8% | 0.6% |
| 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.1% | 3.2% | 4.6% | 4.1% |
| 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.3% | 2.6% | 4.3% | 4.6% (b) |
| 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.7% | 3.3% | 3.0% (g) | 2.8% |
| 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.8% | 0.9% | 1.8% | 1.8% (c) |
| 0.2 | 0.2 | 1.8% | 3.0% | 2.1% (g) | .. |
| 0.3 | 0.3 | 2.5% | 3.0% | .. | .. |
| 0.3 | 0.3 | 8.2% | 7.9% | .. | .. |
| 0.6 | 0.6 | 1.2% | 1.5% | 2.4% | 2.8% |
| | | | | | |
| 0.1 | 0.1 | 4.6% | 5.3% | 13.0% | 8.9% (b) |
| 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.3% | 1.4% | .. | .. |
| 0.1 | 0.1 | 1.2% | 1.2% | 1.9% | 2.9% (b) |
| 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.0% | 4.0% | 4.6% | 6.0% |
| 0.4 | 0.8 | 3.7% | 4.0% | 3.7% | .. |
| 0.1 | 0.0 | 1.9% | 2.3% | 3.0% | 3.0% (g) |
| 0.1 | 0.1 | 1.7% | 2.9% | 3.8% | 4.1% (g) |
| 0.0(d) | 0.0 | 2.4% | 4.1% | 2.5% | 2.4% (g) |
| 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2% | 0.4% | 0.6% | 1.3% (c) |
| 0.0 | 0.1 | 1.3% | 1.4% | 2.9% | 3.4% |
| 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.6% | 2.0% | 2.1% (g) | 2.3% |
| 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.6% | 3.1% | 2.6% | 2.8% (c) |
| 0.3 | 0.7 | 4.3% | 4.7% | 4.5% | 4.8% (b) |
| 0.5 | 0.5 | 7.2% | 9.7% | .. | .. |
| 0.1 | 0.1 | 1.5% | 2.3% | 3.5% | 3.6% |
| 0.1 | 0.1 | 1.3% | 1.7% | 1.0% | 3.7% (c) |
| 0.1 | 0.1 | 4.2% | 4.5% | 3.3% | 3.4% (c) |
| 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.2% | 1.2% (f) | .. | .. |
| 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.9% | 1.0% | .. | .. |
| .. | .. | 5.2% | 6.2% | .. | .. |
| 0.1 | 0.1 | 4.5% | 5.1% | 4.0% | 2.6% |
| .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.6% | 2.1% | 2.5% (g) | .. |
| 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.3% | 2.7% | 2.2% | .. |
| 0.1 | 0.1 | 2.6% | 2.8% | 8.6% | 6.3% |
| 0.2 | 0.2 | 1.7% | 1.0% | 9.9% (c) | 9.5% (b) |
| 0.1 | 0.1 | 3.5% | 3.1% | 2.3% | 2.0% (b) |

**TABLE 4 -** CONTINUED

# LDCs — access to basic social services

■ = MDG

| Countries | ■ School enrolment (% net) Primary 1999/2000 | 2002/2003 | ■ Proportion of population with access to improved sanitation 1990 | 2002 | ■ Proportion of population with sustainable access to an improved water source 1990 | 2002 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| World | .. | .. | 43% | 58% | 75% | 83% |
| Least developed countries | .. | .. | 23% | 35% | 51% | 61% |
| Developing countries | .. | .. | 33% | 48% | 70% | 79% |
| Low income | .. | .. | 20% | 35% | 64% | 77% |
| Low human development | .. | .. | 27% | 32% | 44% | 55% |
| Medium human development | .. | .. | 36% | 51% | 74% | 83% |
| Middle income | .. | .. | 48% | 61% | 77% | 83% |
| High human development | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| High income | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| High income OECD | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |

Notes: (a) 1998/1999; (b) 2001/2002; (c) 2000/2001; (d) 2000; (e) average population for the period has been selected as weight; (f) 2001; (g) 1999/2000.

*Sources: Columns 1-2 and 11-12 UNESCO (2005); columns 3-6 UN (2005) and UNDP (2005a); columns 7-10 World Bank (2005a).*

**TABLE 5**

# LDCs — economic performance

| Countries | GDP per capita (constant international US$ at PPP) 1995 | 2004 | GDP per capita annual growth rate 1990-2003 | Trade Exports of goods and services as % of GDP 1995 | 2003-2004 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Afghanistan | .. | .. | .. | .. | 56.6% (d) |
| Angola | 1782.7 | 2135.8 | 0.4% | 85.4% (a) | 71.3% |
| Bangladesh | 1319.5 | 1735.3 | 3.1% | 10.9% | 14.0% |
| Benin | 867.6 | 1043.2 | 2.2% | 20.2% | 13.7% |
| Bhutan | .. | .. | 3.6% | 36.9% | 21.8% (d) |
| Burkina Faso | 928.6 | 1126.0 | 1.7% | 12.4% | 8.6% |
| Burundi | 693.9 | 624.8 | -3.5% | 12.9% | 8.6% |
| Cambodia | 1450.7 | 2164.2 | 4.0% | 31.7% | 67.7% |
| Cape Verde | 4063.5 | 5289.2 | 3.3% | 19.1% | 33.0% |
| Central African Republic | 1147.8 | 1041.6 | -0.4% | 20.4% | 24.4% |
| Chad | 889.5 | 2120.3 | 0.0% | 22.3% | 53.3% |
| Comoros | 1792.7 | 1715.0 | -1.3% | 19.8% | 12.5% |
| Democratic Republic of the Congo | 963.9 | 650.4 | -6.3% | 28.5% | 18.9% (d) |
| Djibouti | 2273.3 | 1947.8 | -3.3% | 40.8% | 44.6% (e) |
| Equatorial Guinea | 1589.4 | .. | 16.8% | 55.2% | 101.7% (f) |
| Eritrea | 1003.0 | 990.1 | 1.0% | 22.4% | 12.8% |
| Ethiopia | 601.3 | 752.5 | 2.0% | 13.6% | 16.9% |
| Gambia | 1573.2 | 1861.6 | -0.1% | 48.9% | 36.7% |
| Guinea | 1795.5 | 1996.2 | 1.6% | 20.8% | 23.1% |
| Guinea-Bissau | 920.9 | 667.1 | -2.4% | 11.7% | 30.0% |
| Haiti | 1723.2 | 1559.2 | -2.8% | 10.1% | 12.9% (d) |
| Kiribati | .. | .. | .. | 14.5% | 26.8% (e) |
| Lao People´s Democratic Republic | 1258.5 | 1790.7 | 3.7% | 23.2% | 25.5% |
| Lesotho | 1745.9 | 2403.1 | 2.3% | 21.3% | 39.0% |

CONTINUES

| Physicians (per 1,000) | | Public expenditure on Health (% of GDP) | | Education (% of GDP) | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1993/1998 | 2004 | 1998 | 2002 | 1998/1999 | 2002/2003 | |
| 1.4 | (e) | 1.5 | 2.6% | 2.8% | .. | .. |
| 0.1 | (e) | 0.1 | 1.4% | 1.7% | .. | .. |
| 0.9 | (e) | 1.0 | 1.9% | 2.0% | .. | .. |
| 0.4 | (e) | 0.4 | 1.5% | 1.5% | .. | .. |
| 0.1 | (e) | 0.1 | 1.7% | 1.9% | .. | .. |
| 1.1 | (e) | 1.2 | 1.9% | 2.0% | .. | .. |
| | | | | | | |
| 1.6 | (e) | 1.7 | 2.4% | 2.5% | .. | .. |
| 2.6 | (e) | 3.5 | 5.4% | 5.9% | .. | .. |
| | | | | | | |
| 2.8 | (e) | 3.8 | 5.9% | 6.4% | .. | .. |
| 2.8 | (e) | 3.8 | 5.9% | 6.5% | .. | .. |

| Imports of goods and services as % of GDP | | Net foreign direct investment As % of GDP | | Debt service total (% of exports) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1995 | 2003-2004 | 1995 | 2003 | 1995 | 2003 |
| .. | 89.1% (d) | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| 75.9% (a) | 66.8% | 9.4% | 10.2% | 12.0% | 13.7% |
| 17.3% | 20.6% | 0.0% | 0.2% | 13.2% | 5.9% |
| 33.0% | 25.9% | 0.4% | 1.4% | 6.8% | 6.9% |
| 41.6% | 42.7% (d) | 0.0% | 0.0% | 10.9% | 4.6% (d) |
| 27.1% | 22.9% | 0.4% | 0.3% | 12.2% (a) | 11.2% |
| 27.3% | 24.8% | 0.2% | 0.0% | 27.6% | 65.8% |
| 48.2% | 78.6% | 4.5% | 2.1% | 0.7% | 0.9% |
| 59.1% | 67.2% | 5.3% | 1.9% | 5.0% | 5.7% |
| 27.7% | 30.6% | 0.6% | 0.3% | 12.9% (a) | .. |
| 34.3% | 37.1% | 2.3% | 32.1% | 9.2% (a) | .. |
| 44.6% | 24.5% | 0.4% | 0.3% | 1.6% | .. |
| 23.7% | 22.1% (d) | -0.4% | 2.8% | .. | .. |
| | | | | | |
| 57.6% | 62.8% (e) | 0.6% | 1.8% | 5.5% | .. |
| 104.2% | 173.5% (f) | 77.4% | 49.1% | 2.2% | 2.6% (c) |
| 82.9% | 85.7% | 0.0% | 2.9% | 3.0% (f) | 14.1% |
| 22.1% | 36.3% | 0.2% | 0.9% | 18.4% | 6.8% |
| 73.0% | 38.6% | 2.0% | 16.4% | 15.5% | 11.5% (h) |
| 24.5% | 25.0% | 0.0% | 2.2% | 25.0% | 15.1% |
| 35.1% | 45.0% | 0.0% | 0.9% | 51.7% | 15.1% |
| 30.7% | 37.2% (d) | 0.2% | 0.3% | 50.2% | 4.1% |
| 90.1% | 67.4% (e) | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| 37.3% | 25.3% | 5.4% | 0.9% | 6.3% | 9.4% |
| | | | | | |
| 120.2% | 90.5% | 29.5% | 3.9% | 6.1% | 8.7% |

**TABLE 5 -** CONTINUED

# LDCs — economic performance

| Countries | GDP per capita (constant international US$ at PPP) | | GDP per capita annual growth rate | Trade Exports of goods and services as % of GDP | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1995 | 2004 | 1990-2003 | 1995 | 2003-2004 |
| Liberia | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| Madagascar | 821.3 | 787.4 | -0.9% | 24.1% | 28.4% |
| Malawi | 560.8 | 584.7 | 0.9% | 29.7% | 27.3% |
| Maldives | .. | .. | 4.7% | 92.7% | 85.2% |
| Mali | 697.9 | 952.9 | 2.4% | 21.1% | 26.4% |
| Mauritania | 1684.2 | 2074.0 | 1.6% | 49.1% | 40.2% |
| Mozambique | 684.1 | 1140.9 | 4.6% | 15.2% | 22.8% |
| Myanmar | .. | .. | 5.7% | 1.2% | 0.4% (g) |
| Nepal | 1179.8 | 1374.6 | 2.2% | 25.0% | 17.2% |
| Niger | 787.1 | 775.0 | -0.6% | 17.2% | 15.5% |
| Rwanda | 911.8 | 1227.2 | 0.7% | 5.2% | 8.6% |
| Samoa | 4420.6 | 5270.1 | 2.4% | 34.6% | 32.6% (e) |
| São Tomé and Principe | .. | .. | -0.2% | 20.6% | 38.5% |
| Senegal | 1333.0 | 1614.8 | 1.3% | 34.5% | 27.8% |
| Sierra Leone | 629.7 | 754.1 | -5.3% | 17.4% | 25.9% |
| Solomon Islands | 2459.1 | 1641.4 | -2.5% | 62.5% | 31.5% (d) |
| Somalia | .. | .. | .. | 9.8% (b) | .. |
| Sudan | 1410.7 | 1868.9 | 3.3% | 8.0% (c) | 16.3% |
| Timor-Leste | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| Togo | 1527.3 | 1591.9 | 0.4% | 20.7% | 18.3% |
| Tuvalu | .. | .. | .. | 32.4% | 33.5% |
| Uganda | 1061.5 | 1440.0 | 3.9% | .. | .. |
| United Republic of Tanzania | 485.9 | 611.9 | 1.0% | 11.8% | 13.7% |
| Vanuatu | 3289.2 | 2678.0 | -0.3% | 45.8% | 46.8% (g) |
| Yemen | 753.2 | 822.0 | 2.4% | 50.7% | 27.3% |
| Zambia | 770.6 | 851.7 | -0.9% | 36.0% | 20.9% |
| World | 6732.9 | 8264.8 | 1.4% | 22.9% | 30.6% |
| Least developed countries | 1049.0 | 1270.6 | 2.0% | 18.6% | 20.1% |
| Developing countries | 3163.3 | 4306.0 | 2.9% | 21.8% | 30.6% |
| Low income | 1603.9 | 2160.3 | 0.1% | 17.5% | 22.0% |
| Low human development | 920.3 | 1029.7 | 2.8% | 29.5% | 30.3% |
| Medium human development | 3186.3 | 4487.4 | 2.4% | 21.5% | 30.6% |
| Middle income | 4362.2 | 6096.3 | 2.5% | 26.0% | 37.0% |
| High human development | 21336.2 | 25527.1 | 1.8% | .. | .. |
| High income | 24718.4 | 29508.2 | 1.8% | .. | .. |
| High income OECD | 24807.1 | 29623.9 | 1.9% | .. | .. |

Notes: (a) 1994; (b) 1990; (c) 1996; (d) 2002; (e) 2000; (f) 1998; (g) 1999; (h) 1997.

*Sources: Columns 1-2 and 4-11 World Bank (2005a); column 3 UNDP (2005a).*

| Imports of goods and services as % of GDP | | **Net foreign direct investment** As % of GDP | | **Debt service total** (% of exports) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1995 | 2003-2004 | 1995 | 2003 | 1995 | 2003 |
| .. | .. | 3.4% | 0.0% | 0.8% (h) | 0.1% |
| 31.7% | 43.3% | 0.3% | 0.2% | 7.6% | 6.1% |
| 47.0% | 38.2% | -1.4% | 1.4% | 24.9% | 8.0% |
| 77.2% | 66.1% | 1.8% | 2.0% | 3.4% | 3.6% |
| 36.2% | 30.8% | 4.5% | 3.0% | 13.4% | 5.8% |
| 59.5% | 86.9% | 0.7% | 18.1% | 22.9% | 27.7% (f) |
| 39.9% | 39.4% | 1.9% | 7.8% | 34.5% | 6.9% |
| 2.0% | 1.1% (g) | .. | .. | 17.8% | 4.2% |
| 34.5% | 30.6% | 0.0% | 0.3% | 7.5% | 6.0% |
| 24.3% | 25.1% | 0.4% | 1.1% | 16.7% | .. |
| 25.8% | 27.7% | 0.2% | 0.3% | 20.4% | 14.6% |
| 59.8% | 81.6% (e) | 1.7% | 0.0% | 4.2% | 5.1% (g) |
| 100.1% | 105.2% | 0.0% | 16.8% | 34.0% (b) | 30.9% |
| 40.1% | 38.8% | 0.7% | 1.2% | 16.8% | 8.7% |
| 24.8% | 54.6% | 0.8% | 0.3% | 54.3% | 12.4% |
| 73.0% | 33.3% (d) | 0.6% | -0.9% | 3.8% | 4.8% (g) |
| 37.7% (b) | .. | 0.6% (b) | .. | .. | .. |
| 19.3% (c) | 12.1% | 0.0% | 7.6% | 6.7% | 0.9% |
| .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| 37.4% | 47.0% | 2.0% | 1.1% | 6.0% | 1.9% |
| .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| 20.8% | 27.5% | 2.1% | 3.1% | 19.8% | 7.1% |
| 38.6% | 27.4% | 2.3% | 2.4% | 17.9% | 5.1% |
| 54.8% | 60.6% (g) | 13.6% | 6.9% | 1.2% | 1.4% |
| 58.0% | 36.4% | -5.1% | -0.8% | 3.1% | 3.1% |
| 39.8% | 26.6% | 2.8% | 2.3% | 47.0% (h) | 29.6% |
| | | | | | |
| 24.3% | 31.1% | 2.2% | 2.0% | 19.1% | 16.1% |
| 29.2% | 31.5% | 0.9% | 2.5% | 15.7% | 6.8% |
| 23.5% | 31.2% | 2.5% | 2.0% | 20.2% | 16.2% |
| 21.2% | 25.6% | 1.3% | 1.5% | 24.8% | 14.9% |
| 36.8% | 34.7% | 1.6% | 2.5% | .. | .. |
| 22.8% | 30.8% | 2.4% | 2.1% | 18.8% | 16.1% |
| | | | | | |
| 26.3% | 35.4% | 3.2% | 2.7% | 15.6% | 17.0% |
| .. | .. | 1.5% | 1.4% | .. | .. |
| | | | | | |
| .. | .. | 1.0% | 1.1% | .. | .. |
| .. | .. | 1.0% | 1.1% | .. | .. |

**TABLE 6**

# LDCs — access to basic social services LDCs — support from rich countries (members of the OECD's Development Assistance Committee)

| | Trade | | Debt relief | | Official development assistance | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Goods imports from LDCs | | Bilateral pledges to the HIPC trust fund | Gross bilateral debt forgiveness | | | | |
| | Total (US $ millions) | Share of total imports (%) | (US $ millions) | (US $ millions) | ODA per capita of donor country (2002 US$) | | To LDCs (% of total) | |
| **Countries** | 2003 | | 2004 | 1990-2003 | 1990 | 2003 | 1990 | 2003 |
| Australia | 148 | 0.2% | 14 | 83 | 49 | 50 | 18% | 21% |
| Austria | 179 | 0.2% | 50 | 709 | 21 | 51 | 63% | 33% |
| Belgium | 2,181 | 0.9% | 64 | 1,468 | 88 | 145 | 41% | 59% |
| Canada | 770 | 0.3% | 165 | 1,567 | 80 | 55 | 30% | 31% |
| Denmark | 168 | 0.3% | 80 | 377 | 227 | 265 | 39% | 38% |
| Finland | 157 | 0.4% | 51 | 156 | 131 | 89 | 38% | 33% |
| France | 2,598 | 0.7% | 258 | 15,878 | 119 | 100 | 32% | 41% |
| Germany | 2,761 | 0.5% | 350 | 7,371 | 96 | 68 | 28% | 37% |
| Greece | 180 | 0.4% | 17 | .. | .. | 26 | .. | 15% |
| Ireland | 136 | 0.3% | 25 | .. | 19 | 103 | 37% | 53% |
| Italy | 1,400 | 0.5% | 217 | 2,334 | 54 | 34 | 41% | 45% |
| Japan | 1,584 | 0.4% | 256 | 4,331 | 83 | 66 | 19% | 22% |
| Luxembourg | 6 | .. | 4 | .. | 73 | 354 | 39% | 34% |
| Netherlands | 657 | 0.3% | 242 | 2,170 | 179 | 199 | 33% | 32% |
| New Zealand | 29 | 0.2% | 2 | .. | 27 | 32 | 19% | 27% |
| Norway | 81 | 0.2% | 127 | 237 | 314 | 388 | 44% | 39% |
| Portugal | 234 | 0.5% | 24 | 476 | 18 | 25 | 70% | 64% |
| Spain | 1,647 | 0.8% | 165 | 1,208 | 23 | 37 | 20% | 17% |
| Sweden | 169 | 0.2% | 109 | 286 | 184 | 218 | 39% | 34% |
| Switzerland | 118 | 0.1% | 93 | 340 | 119 | 154 | 43% | 31% |
| United Kingdom | 1,587 | 0.4% | 436 | 2,574 | 55 | 95 | 32% | 36% |
| United States | 11,525 | 0.9% | 750 | 10,882 | 58 | 55 | 19% | 28% |
| Development Assistance Committee (DAC) Countries | .. | .. | .. | .. | 72 | 70 | 29% | 33% |

*Source: Columns 1-8 UNDP (2005a).*

**TABLE 7**

# LDCs — human security

| Countries | Refugees country of (a) (b) Asylum 2004 | Refugees country of (a) (b) Origin | Internally displaced people 2002-2005 | People affected by natural disasters (c) 1991/1995 | People affected by natural disasters (c) 1996/2000 | Military expenditure to education and health expenditure (% of GDP)(d) 1998/2002 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Afghanistan | 30 | 2,084,925 | 153,192-200,000 | 65,040 | 559,611 | .. |
| Angola | 13,970 | 228,838 | 91,240 | 0 | 24,800 | 2.0% |
| Bangladesh | 20,449 | 5,730 | 500,000 | 11,771,305 | 5,585,997 | 0.4% |
| Benin | 4,802 | 309 | .. | 25,800 | 129,180 | .. |
| Bhutan | .. | 105,255 | .. | 120 | 0 | .. |
| Burkina Faso | 492 | 582 | .. | 13,300 | 4,300 | .. |
| Burundi | 48,808 | 485,764 | 117,000 | 0 | 183,682 | 1.6% |
| Cambodia | 382 | 18,121 | .. | 135,800 | 1,076,515 | 1.1% |
| Cape Verde | .. | 8 | .. | 260 | 0 | 0.1% |
| Central African Republic | 25,020 | 31,069 | Undetermined | 408 | 7,200 | 0.3% |
| Chad | 259,880 | 52,663 | .. | 68,069 | 25,701 | 0.3% |
| Comoros | .. | 50 | .. | 0 | 0 | .. |
| Democratic Republic of the Congo | 199,323 | 462,203 | 2,170,000 | 0 | 18,200 | .. |
| Djibouti | 18,035 | 495 | .. | 24,155 | 70,000 | 0.7% |
| Equatorial Guinea | .. | 549 | .. | 0 | 0 | .. |
| Eritrea | 4,240 | 131,119 | 50,509 | 0 | 67,000 | 4.3% |
| Ethiopia | 115,980 | 63,105 | 150,000-265,000 | 1,365,375 | 2,460,860 | 1.1% |
| Gambia | 7,343 | 684 | .. | 0 | 6,200 | 0.2% |
| Guinea | 139,252 | 4,782 | 82,000 | 1,213 | 0 | 0.7% |
| Guinea-Bissau | 7,536 | 1,018 | .. | 344 | 240 | 0.6% |
| Haiti | .. | 9,208 | .. | 301,000 | 2,400 | .. |
| Kiribati | .. | 32 | .. | 0 | 16,800 | .. |
| Lao People´s Democratic Republic | .. | 16,114 | .. | 284,098 | 178,000 | 0.5% |
| Lesotho | .. | 7 | .. | 100,300 | 46 | 0.2% |
| Liberia | 15,172 | 335,467 | 110,000 | 0 | 1,000 | .. |
| Madagascar | .. | 135 | .. | 315,000 | 395,500 | 1.7% |
| Malawi | 3,682 | 94 | .. | 3,183,600 | 87,400 | 0.1% |
| Maldives | .. | 3 | .. | 0 | 0 | .. |
| Mali | 11,256 | 483 | .. | 60,400 | 757 | 0.4% |
| Mauritania | 473 | 31,131 | .. | 89,383 | 5,040 | 0.3% |
| Mozambique | 623 | 104 | .. | 1,060,000 | 434,070 | 0.4% |
| Myanmar | .. | 161,006 | 540,000 | 109,855 | 20,877 | 2.0% |
| Nepal | 124,928 | 1,416 | 100,000-200,000 | 112,826 | 45,120 | 0.2% |
| Niger | 344 | 689 | .. | 0 | 4,852 | 0.2% |
| Rwanda | 50,221 | 63,808 | Undetermined | 0 | 232,909 | 0.7% |
| Samoa | .. | .. | .. | 17,000 | 0 | .. |
| São Tomé and Principe | .. | 39 | .. | 0 | 0 | .. |
| Senegal | 20,804 | 8,332 | 64,000 | 1,000 | 73,171 | 0.3% |
| Sierra Leone | 65,437 | 41,801 | .. | 0 | 40,000 | 0.6% |
| Solomon Islands | .. | 61 | .. | 17,700 | 76 | .. |
| Somalia | 357 | 389,272 | 370,000-400,000 | 1,700 | 361,100 | .. |
| Sudan | 141,588 | 730,612 | 5,355,000 | 1,831,193 | 765,348 | .. |
| Timor-Leste | 3 | 221 | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| Togo | 11,285 | 10,819 | .. | 12,000 | 19,081 | .. |
| Tuvalu | .. | 3 | .. | 0 | 0 | .. |
| Uganda | 250,482 | 31,963 | 1,800,000 | 10,000 | 235,800 | 0.6% |
| United Republic of Tanzania | 602,088 | 985 | .. | 200,303 | 1,581,756 | 0.3% |
| Vanuatu | .. | .. | .. | 1,230 | 2,880 | .. |
| Yemen | 66,384 | 1,605 | .. | 45,200 | 27,850 | 0.5% |
| Zambia | 173,907 | 124 | .. | 594,641 | 262,400 | 0.2% |

CONTINUES

**TABLE 7 -** CONTINUED

# LDCs — human security

| Countries | Refugees country of (a) (b) Asylum 2004 | Refugees country of (a) (b) Origin 2004 | Internally displaced people 2002-2005 | People affected by natural disasters (c) 1991/1995 | People affected by natural disasters (c) 1996/2000 | Military expenditure to education and health expenditure (% of GDP)(d) 1998/2002 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| World | 9,236,521 | 8,693,752 T | 25,300,000 T | 191,926,983 | 208,707,755 T | 0.5% (e) |
| Least developed countries | 2,404,576 | 5,512,804 T | .. | 21,819,618 | 15,013,718 T | 0.8% (e) |
| Developing countries | 6,208,213 | 7,399,024 T | .. | 185,952,142 | 203,279,991 T | 0.5% (e) |
| Low income | 4,068,347 | 6,094,767 T | .. | 65,531,090 | 74,357,564 T | 0.6% (e) |
| Low human development | 2,219,783 | 1,680,169 T | .. | 8,407,491 | 7,556,533 T | .. (e) |
| Medium human development | 4,258,964 | 3,389,796 T | .. | 177,090,620 | 195,013,600 T | 0.5% (e) |
| Middle income | 2,789,976 | 2,595,272 T | .. | 121,587,337 | 130,953,248 T | 0.4% (e) |
| High human development | 2,419,330 | 264,893 T | .. | 5,321,632 | 4,420,195 T | 0.2% (e) |
| High income | .. | 3,730 T | .. | 4,836,397 | 3,398,896 T | 0.2% (e) |
| High income OECD | 2,371,543 | 1,879 T | .. | 4,807,899 | 3,396,621 T | 0.2% (e) |

Notes: (a) Provisional 2004 data; (b) totals for origin of refugees excludes "Tibetans", "statless" and "various" categroies; (c) average calculated over specified period; one estimate over period necessary to calculate average; (d) an average over the years 1998 to 2002 for each of the indicator was taken where the minimum necessary number to calculate the average for each of the indicator is one and at least one estimate exists over the period; (e) average population for the period 1998/2002 used for aggregation.

*Sources: Columns 1-2 UNHCR (2005); column 3 IDP (2005); columns 4-5 GEO-3 (2005); column 6 World Bank (2005a).*

**TABLE 8**

# LDCs — gender indicators

| Countries | Ratio of literate females to literate males (ages 15 and above) 2000-2004 | Ratio of female to male gross primary school enrolment (%) 1999/2000 | Ratio of female to male gross primary school enrolment (%) 2002/2003 | Ratio of estimated female to male earned income 1991-2003 | Female economic activity rate (ages 15 and above) Index (1990=100) 2003 | Female economic activity rate (ages 15 and above) As % of male rate | Female legislators, senior officials and managers (% of total) 1992-2001 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Afghanistan | .. | 7.5% | 52.5% | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| Angola | 65.5% | 86.3% | .. | 62% | 98 | 82% | .. |
| Bangladesh | 62.4% | 100.0% | 104.3% | 54% | 101 | 76% | 8% |
| Benin | 48.8% | 67.3% | 72.4% | 69% | 96 | 90% | .. |
| Bhutan | .. | .. | .. | .. | 100 | 65% | .. |
| Burkina Faso | 43.5% (a) | 70.0% | 73.6% | 73% | 97 | 85% | .. |
| Burundi | 77.6% | 80.0% | 80.2% | 72% | 98 | 89% | .. |
| Cambodia | 75.6% | 86.4% | 90.0% | 76% | 98 | 97% | 14% |
| Cape Verde | 79.7% | 96.9% | 95.2% | 48% | 110 | 54% | .. |
| Central African Republic | 51.7% | .. | 67.9% | 61% | 96 | 78% | .. |
| Chad | 31.4% | 60.2% | 64.2% | 59% | 102 | 77% | .. |
| Comoros | 77.4% | 85.6% | 82.7% | 55% | 99 | 73% | .. |
| Democratic Republic of the Congo | 65.0% | 90.4% (c) | .. | 55% | 97 | 72% | .. |
| Djibouti | .. | 73.8% | 76.1% | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| Equatorial Guinea | 82.9% | 95.3% | 90.9% (d) | 40% | 101 | 52% | .. |
| Eritrea | .. | 82.8% | 81.4% | 51% | 98 | 87% | .. |
| Ethiopia | 68.7% | 65.2% | 72.4% | 52% | 98 | 67% | .. |
| Gambia | .. | 86.0% | 97.7% | 59% | 101 | 78% | .. |
| Guinea | .. | 68.0% | 77.2% | 68% | 97 | 89% | .. |

CONTINUES

**TABLE 8 -** CONTINUED

# LDCs — gender indicators

| Countries | Ratio of literate females to literate males (ages 15 and above) 2000-2004 | Ratio of female to male gross primary school enrolment (%) 1999/2000 | 2002/2003 | Ratio of estimated female to male earned income 1991-2003 | Female economic activity rate (ages 15 and above) Index (1990=100) 2003 | As % of male rate | Female legislators, senior officials and managers (% of total) 1992-2001 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Guinea-Bissau | .. | 66.7% | 66.7% (e) | 49% | 100 | 63% | .. |
| Haiti | 93.0% | .. | .. | 56% | 97 | 70% | .. |
| Kiribati | .. | 101.5% (c) | 116.5% | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| Lao People´s Democratic Republic | 79.1% | 85.5% | 87.1% | 65% | 101 | 85% | .. |
| Lesotho | 122.5% | 107.7% | 101.6% | 39% | 103 | 56% | .. |
| Liberia | 54.4% | 73.0% | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| Madagascar | 85.3% | 96.2% | 95.9% | 59% | 99 | 78% | .. |
| Malawi | 72.1% (a) | 95.2% | 95.8% | 68% | 97 | 90% | .. |
| Maldives | 100.2% | 100.8% | 98.3% | .. | 101 | 80% | 15% |
| Mali | 44.5% (a) | 75.4% | 75.8% | 60% | 97 | 79% | .. |
| Mauritania | 72.9% | 94.4% | 97.8% | 56% | 97 | 74% | .. |
| Mozambique | 50.4% | 75.3% | 81.6% | 68% | 99 | 92% | .. |
| Myanmar | 92.0% | 98.9% | 101.1% | .. | 99 | 75% | .. |
| Nepal | 55.6% | 80.5% | 88.9% | 51% | 101 | 67% | .. |
| Niger | 47.9% | 66.7% | 70.6% | 57% | 99 | 75% | .. |
| Rwanda | 83.5% | 95.9% | 100.0% | 62% | 98 | 88% | .. |
| Samoa | 99.4% | 97.0% | 97.2% | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| São Tomé and Principe | .. | 96.3% (c) | 93.8% (d) | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| Senegal | 57.3% | 87.0% | 92.8% | 55% | 101 | 72% | .. |
| Sierra Leone | 51.5% | .. | 69.9% (e) | 42% | 107 | 55% | .. |
| Solomon Islands | .. | .. | .. | 66% | 97 | 92% | .. |
| Somalia | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| Sudan | 72.0% | 84.7% | 87.5% | 32% | 116 | 42% | .. |
| Timor-Leste | .. | .. | .. | .. | 96 | 86% | .. |
| Togo | 56.0% | 78.3% | 83.3% | 47% | 101 | 62% | .. |
| Tuvalu | .. | 95.3% (c) | 113.5% (d) | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| Uganda | 75.2% | 90.6% | 97.9% | 67% | 98 | 88% | .. |
| United Republic of Tanzania | 80.2% | 101.6% | 96.5% | 71% | 97 | 93% | 49% |
| Vanuatu | .. | 99.1% | 100.0% | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| Yemen | 41.1% | 63.4% | 69.4% | 31% | 110 | 37% | 4% |
| Zambia | 78.4% (a) | 92.7% | 92.9% | 56% | 98 | 74% | .. |
| World | 81.9% (b) | 91.2% | 94.2% | 52.3% (f) | 103 | 69% | .. |
| Least developed countries | 67.1% (b) | 86.8% | 90.4% | 56.1% (f) | 100 | 74% | .. |
| Developing countries | 80.6% (b) | 88.6% | 92.6% | 50.7% (f) | 102 | 67% | |
| Low income | 68.6% (b) | 84.4% | 90.3% | 45.9% (f) | 103 | 61% | .. |
| Low human development | 70.5% (b) | 80.5% | 82.4% | 54.9% (f) | 99 | 71% | .. |
| Medium human development | 82.4% (b) | .. | .. | 51.5% (f) | 101 | 68% | .. |
| Middle income | 91.9% (b) | .. | .. | 55.6% (f) | 102 | 73% | .. |
| High human development | .. | 99.1% | 99.4% | 54.1% (f) | 106 | 71% | .. |
| High income | .. | 99.2% | 99.6% | 56.0% (f) | 107 | 74% | .. |
| High income OECD | .. | 99.2% | 99.6% | 56.1% (f) | 107 | 75% | .. |

Notes: (a) 1995-1999; (b) aggregates calculated using average population for period of data; some estimates from year other than specified; (c) 1998/1999; (d) 2001/2002; (e) 2000/2001; (f) aggregates calculated using average population for period of data.

*Sources: Columns 1-3 UNESCO (2005) and World Bank (2005a); columns 4-7 UNDP (2005a).*

**TABLE 9**

# LDC — international treaties

| Countries | International Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (1948) | International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrim-ination (1965) | International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966) | International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (1966) | Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimin-ation against Women (1979) | Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (1984) | Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989) | Convention against Corruption (2003) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Afghanistan | I | I | I | I | I | I | I | m |
| Angola | I | I | I | m | I | I | I | I |
| Bangladesh | I | I | I | I | I | I | I | I |
| Benin | I | I | I | I | I | I | I | I |
| Bhutan | m | m | I | I | | | | |
| Burkina Faso | I | I | I | I | I | I | I | m |
| Burundi | I | I | I | I | I | I | I | I |
| Cambodia | I | I | I | I | I | I | I | I |
| Cape Verde | I | I | I | I | I | I | m | I |
| Central African Republic | I | I | I | I | I | m | I | I |
| Chad | I | I | I | I | I | I | I | I |
| Comoros | I | I | I | I | I | I | m | I |
| Democratic Republic of the Congo | I | I | I | I | I | I | I | I |
| Djibouti | I | I | I | I | I | I | I | I |
| Equatorial Guinea | I | I | I | I | I | I | I | I |
| Eritrea | I | I | I | I | I | I | I | I |
| Ethiopia | I | I | I | I | I | I | I | m |
| Gambia | I | I | I | I | I | I | I | I |
| Guinea | I | I | I | I | I | I | I | m |
| Guinea-Bissau | m | m | I | I | I | I | I | I |
| Haiti | I | I | I | I | I | m | I | I |
| Kiribati | | I | I | I | I | I | I | I |
| Lao People´s Democratic Republic | I | I | I | m | I | I | m | I |
| Lesotho | I | I | I | I | I | I | I | I |
| Liberia | I | I | I | I | I | I | I | I |
| Madagascar | I | I | I | I | m | I | I | I |
| Malawi | I | I | I | I | I | I | m | I |
| Maldives | I | I | I | I | I | I | | |
| Mali | I | I | I | I | I | I | I | m |
| Mauritania | I | I | I | I | I | I | I | I |
| Mozambique | I | I | I | I | I | I | m | I |
| Myanmar | I | I | I | I | I | | | |
| Nepal | I | I | I | I | I | I | I | m |
| Niger | I | I | I | I | I | I | I | I |
| Rwanda | I | I | I | I | I | I | m | I |
| Samoa | | I | I | | | | | |
| São Tomé and Principe | m | m | m | I | m | I | I | I |
| Senegal | I | I | I | I | I | I | I | m |
| Sierra Leone | I | I | I | I | I | I | m | I |
| Solomon Islands | I | I | I | I | I | I | | |
| Somalia | I | I | I | I | m | | | |

CONTINUES

| | Freedom of association and collective bargaining | | Elimination of forced and compulsory labour | | Elimination of discrimination in respect of employment and occupation | | Abolition of child labour | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Convention 87 | Convention 98 | Convention 29 | Convention 105 | Convention 100 | Convention 111 | Convention 138 | Convention 182 |
| | I | I | I | | | | | |
| | I | I | I | I | | | | |
| | I | I | I | I | I | I | | |
| | I | I | I | I | I | I | I | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | I | I | I | I | I | I | I | I |
| | I | I | I | I | I | I | I | |
| | I | I | I | I | I | I | | |
| | I | I | I | I | I | I | | |
| | I | I | I | I | I | I | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | I | I | I | I | I | | | |
| | I | I | I | I | I | I | I | |
| | I | I | I | I | I | I | I | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | I | I | I | I | | | | |
| | I | I | I | I | I | I | | |
| | I | I | I | I | | | | |
| | I | I | I | I | I | I | I | I |
| | I | I | I | I | I | I | I | |
| | I | I | I | I | I | I | I | I |
| | I | I | I | | | | | |
| | I | I | I | I | | | | |
| | I | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | I | I | I | I | I | I | I | |
| | I | I | | | | | | |
| | I | I | I | I | I | I | | |
| | I | I | I | I | I | I | I | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | I | I | I | I | I | I | I | I |
| | I | I | I | I | I | I | | |
| | I | I | I | I | I | I | I | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | I | I | I | I | I | I | | |
| | I | I | I | I | I | I | | |
| | I | I | I | I | I | I | I | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | I | I | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | I | I | I | I | I | I | I | I |
| | I | I | I | I | I | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

**TABLE 9 -** CONTINUED

# LDC — international treaties

| Countries | International Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (1948) | International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrim-ination (1965) | International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966) | International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (1966) | Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimin-ation against Women (1979) | Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (1984) | Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989) | Convention against Corruption (2003) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Sudan | I | I | I | I | I | I | m | I |
| Timor-Leste | I | I | I | I | I | I | I | |
| Togo | I | I | I | I | I | I | I | m |
| Tuvalu | | I | I | m | | | | |
| Uganda | I | I | I | I | I | I | I | I |
| United Republic of Tanzania | I | I | I | I | I | I | m | I |
| Vanuatu | | I | I | | | | | |
| Yemen | I | I | I | I | I | I | I | m |
| Zambia | I | I | I | I | I | I | m | I |

Notes

I Ratification, accession or succession OR convention ratified

m Signature not yet followed by ratification

Convention 87 Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organize Convention (1948)

Convention 98 Right to Organize and Collective Bargaining Convention (1949)

Convention 29 Forced Labour Convention (1930)

Convention 105 Abolition of Forced Labour Convention (1957)

**TABLE 10**

# Governance in LDCs

| Countries | Number of political parties with seats in the parliament as listed by the International Organization of Parliaments of Sovereign States (IPU) | | | | Parliamentary elections listed by the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA) (various initial years) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Year | Lower or single house | Year | Upper house or senate | |
| Afghanistan | 2005 | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| Angola | 1992 | 12 | .. | .. | 1 |
| Bangladesh | 2001 | 6 (a) | .. | .. | 7 |
| Benin | 2003 | 12 (b) | .. | .. | 3 |
| Bhutan | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| Burkina Faso | 2002 | 11 (c) | .. | .. | 5 |
| Burundi | 2005 | 6 | 2005 | 3 | 1 |
| Cambodia | 2003 | 3 | 1999 | 3 | 3 |
| Cape Verde | 2001 | 3 | .. | .. | 3 |
| Central African Republic | 2005 | 8 (d) | .. | .. | 2 |
| Chad | 2002 | 15 | .. | .. | 1 |
| Comoros | 2004 | 2 | .. | .. | 2 |
| Democratic Republic of the Congo | 2003 | .. | 2003 | .. | 2 |
| Djibouti | 2003 | 4 (e) | .. | .. | 2 |
| Equatorial Guinea | 2004 | 3 | .. | .. | .. |
| Eritrea | 1994 | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| Ethiopia | 2005 | 12 (d) (f) | 2005 | .. | 2 |
| Gambia | 2002 | 3 | .. | .. | 6 |

CONTINUES

| Freedom of association and collective bargaining | | Elimination of forced and compulsory labour | | Elimination of discrimination in respect of employment and occupation | | Abolition of child labour | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Convention 87 | Convention 98 | Convention 29 | Convention 105 | Convention 100 | Convention 111 | Convention 138 | Convention 182 |
| I | I | I | I | I | I | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| I | I | I | I | I | I | I | I |
| | | | | | | | |
| I | I | I | I | | | | |
| I | I | I | I | I | I | I | |
| | | | | | | | |
| I | I | I | I | I | I | I | I |
| I | I | I | I | I | I | I | |

Notes (continued)

Convention 100 Equal Remuneration Convention (1951)
Convention 111 Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention (1958)
Convention 138 Minimum Age Convention (1973)
Convention 182 Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention (1999)

*Source: UNDP (2005a)*

| Date of most recent Polity transition (3 or more point changes in Polity score) (j) | | Status index (l) | Progress 2001-2005 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| End date of previous regime | Begin date of current regime | Overall progress 1998-2003 | Trends in democratic development | Trends in economic development |
| .. | .. | _ | _ | _ |
| 5-Mar-91 | 15-Apr-97 | _ | No significant changes | No significant changes |
| 25-Sep-91 | 26-Sep-91 | No significant changes | No significant changes | _ |
| 25-Feb-90 | 25-Mar-91 | No significant changes | No significant changes | No significant changes |
| .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| 18-Sep-01 | 19-Sep-01 | No significant changes | No significant changes | No significant changes |
| 5-Jun-98 | 5-Jun-98 | No significant changes | No significant changes | No significant changes |
| 30-Nov-98 | 30-Nov-98 | No significant changes | No significant changes | No significant changes |
| .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| 7-Jun-91 | 23-Aug-93 | _ | _ | No significant changes |
| 1-Oct-91 | 16-Mar-92 | No significant changes | No significant changes | No significant changes |
| 30-Apr-99 | 30-Apr-99 | .. | .. | .. |
| 6-Dec-92 | .. | _ | No significant changes | No significant changes |
| | | | | |
| 9-Apr-99 | 9-Apr-99 | .. | .. | .. |
| 28-Feb-69 | 1-Mar-69 | .. | .. | .. |
| .. | 24-May-93 (k) | _ | _ | _ |
| .. | 24-May-93 | _ | No significant changes | No significant changes |
| 23-Jul-94 | 24-Jul-94 | .. | .. | .. |

**TABLE 10**

# Governance in LDCs

| Countries | Number of political parties with seats in the parliament as listed by the International Organization of Parliaments of Sovereign States (IPU) | | | | Parliamentary elections listed by the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA) (various initial years) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Year | Lower or single house | Year | Upper house or senate | |
| Guinea | 2002 | 6 (c) | .. | .. | 2 |
| Guinea-Bissau | 2004 | 5 | .. | .. | 2 |
| Haiti | 2000 | 5 (a) | 2000 | 1 | 3 |
| Kiribati | 2003 | .. | .. | .. | 6 |
| Lao People´s Democratic Republic | 2002 | 1 | .. | .. | .. |
| Lesotho | 2002 | 7 (c) | 2002 | .. | 5 |
| Liberia | 2005 | 12 (d) | 2005 | 10 (d) | .. |
| Madagascar | 2002 | 7 (a) | 2001 | .. | 6 |
| Malawi | 2004 | 7 (d) | .. | .. | 4 |
| Maldives | 2005 | .. | .. | .. | 3 |
| Mali | 2002 | 5 (d) | .. | .. | 2 |
| Mauritania | .. | .. (g) | .. | .. | 3 |
| Mozambique | 2004 | 2 (h) | .. | .. | 2 |
| Myanmar | .. | .. (g) | .. | .. | 2 |
| Nepal | 1999 | 4 (c) | 2001 | 4 | 7 |
| Niger | 2004 | 7 | .. | .. | 4 |
| Rwanda | 2003 | 3 (i) | 2003 | .. | .. |
| Samoa | 2001 | 4 (d) | .. | .. | 3 |
| São Tomé and Principe | 2002 | 3 | .. | .. | 4 |
| Senegal | 2001 | 10 | .. | .. | 6 |
| Sierra Leone | 2002 | 3 | .. | .. | 4 |
| Solomon Islands | 2001 | 5 (d) | .. | .. | 5 |
| Somalia | 2004 | .. | .. | .. | 1 |
| Sudan | 2005 | .. | .. | .. | 3 |
| Timor-Leste | 2001 | 13 (d) | .. | .. | 1 |
| Togo | 2002 | 6 (d) | .. | .. | 5 |
| Tuvalu | 2002 | .. | .. | .. | 3 |
| Uganda | 2001 | .. | .. | .. | 4 |
| United Republic of Tanzania | 2000 | 5 | .. | .. | 2 |
| Vanuatu | 2004 | 11 (d) | .. | .. | 5 |
| Yemen | 2003 | 6 (d) | 2001 | .. | 3 |
| Zambia | 2001 | 8 (d) | .. | .. | 3 |

Notes: (a) Includes the categories "others"" and "independents"; (b) parliament formed by two groups, the presidential movement (eight parties) and the opposition (four parties); (c) includes the category "others"; (d) includes the category "independents"; (e) the four parties form the political group Union for the Presidential Majority (UMP); (f) two rounds of elections were held for logistical reasons (results reported in this table are those of the first round). The second round took place in the state of Somali only but was boycotted by all parties except the Ethiopian People´s Revolutionary Democratic Front (EPRDF) — an alliance of 24 parties — and the Coalition for Unity and Democracy (CUD), which comprises by four parties; (g) country does not appear in the IPU search result because parliaments there have been dissolved or suspended for an indefinite period; (h) Mozambican National Resistance (RENAMO) contested the elections

| Date of most recent Polity transition (3 or more point changes in Polity score) (j) | | Status index (l) | Progress 2001-2005 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| End date of previous regime | Begin date of current regime | Overall progress 1998-2003 | Trends in democratic development | Trends in economic development |
| 12-Jul-95 | 12-Jul-95 | No significant changes | No significant changes | No significant changes |
| 13-Sep-03 | 14-Sep-03 | .. | .. | .. |
| 10-Jan-99 | 26-Nov-00 | _ | _ | _ |
| .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| 1-Jan-60 | 3-Dec-75 | No significant changes | No significant changes | No significant changes |
| 15-May-98 | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| 16-Sep-90 | 2-Aug-97 | No significant changes | _ | No significant changes |
| 31-Oct-91 | 26-Nov-92 | No significant changes | _ | _ |
| 14-Jun-93 | 18-May-94 | _ | No significant changes | No significant changes |
| .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| 26-Mar-91 | 9-Jun-92 | _ | _ | No significant changes |
| 2-Apr-62 | 3-Apr-62 | .. | .. | .. |
| 27-Oct-94 | 28-Oct-94 | No significant changes | No significant changes | _ |
| 2-Mar-62 | 1-Jul-63 | _ | No significant changes | No significant changes |
| 10-Nov-90 | 11-Nov-90 | _ | _ | No significant changes |
| 9-Apr-99 | 18-Jul-99 | No significant changes | _ | _ |
| 4-Aug-93 | 5-Jul-94 | No significant changes | _ | _ |
| .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| 19-Mar-00 | 20-Mar-00 | No significant changes | _ | No significant changes |
| 25-May-97 | .. | _ | _ | No significant changes |
| .. | 7-Jul-78 (k) | .. | .. | .. |
| 27-Jan-91 | .. | _ | No significant changes | No significant changes |
| 30-Jun-89 | 1-Jul-89 | _ | No significant changes | No significant changes |
| .. | 20-May-02 (k) | .. | .. | .. |
| 26-Aug-91 | 26-Aug-93 | _ | No significant changes | No significant changes |
| .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| 16-Feb-93 | 17-Feb-93 | No significant changes | No significant changes | _ |
| 28-Oct-00 | 29-Oct-00 | No significant changes | No significant changes | _ |
| .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| 22-May-90 | 28-Apr-93 | No significant changes | No significant changes | No significant changes |
| 18-Nov-96 | 18-Nov-96 | No significant changes | No significant changes | No significant changes |

as Renamo-Electoral Coalition; (i) the three parties are Rwandan Patriotic Front (FPR), which has formed a coalition with four other parties, the Democratic Socialist Party (PSD) and the Liberal Party (PL); (j) this is calculated by listing “”the dates of the most recent polity transition of three or more points on the Polity index scale. The end date refers to the date when the previous polity regime ended and the begin date lists the date of the beginning of the current regime”; (k) independence; (l) the Status Index shows the development achieved by 116 states on their way toward democracy and a market economy. States with functioning democratic and market-based structures receive the highest scores.”

*Sources: Columns 1-2 IPU (2005a); column 3 IDEA (2005a); columns 4-5 Gurr et. al (2003); column 6 Bertelsmann (2004) and columns 7-8 Bertelsmann (2005).*

**TABLE 11**

# Political representation in LDCs

| Countries | Women in government at ministerial level (% of total) | Women in parliament (% of total) Lower or single house | | | Upper house or senate | | Quotas (in parliament, political parties and government by law), for women and other categories | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2005 | 1990 | Most recent election | | Most recent election | | Gender | Ethnic |
| Afghanistan | .. | .. | 2005 | .. | .. | .. | Yes | Yes |
| Angola | 5.7% | 15% | 1992 | 15.0% | .. | .. | No | No |
| Bangladesh | 8.3% | 10% | 2001 | 12.8% | .. | .. | Yes | No |
| Benin | 19.0% | 3% | 2003 | 7.2% | .. | .. | No | No |
| Bhutan | 0.0% | 2% | .. | 8.7% | .. | .. | No | Yes |
| Burkina Faso | 14.8% | 0% | 2002 | 11.7% | .. | .. | No | No |
| Burundi | 10.7% | 0% | 2005 | 30.5% | 2005 | 32.7% | No | No |
| Cambodia | 7.1% | 0% | 2003 | 9.8% | 1999 | 13.1% | No | No |
| Cape Verde | 18.8% | 12% | 2001 | 11.1% | .. | .. | No | No |
| Central African Republic | 10.0% | 4% | 2005 | .. | .. | .. | No | No |
| Chad | 11.5% | 0% | 2002 | 6.5% | .. | .. | No | No |
| Comoros | .. | 0% | 2004 | 3.0% | .. | .. | No | No |
| Democratic Republic of the Congo | 12.5% | 5% | 2003 | 12.0% | 2003 | 2.5% | No | No |
| Djibouti | 5.3% | 0% | 2003 | 10.8% | .. | .. | Yes | No |
| Equatorial Guinea | 4.5% | 13% | 2004 | 18.0% | .. | .. | No | No |
| Eritrea | 17.6% | 0% | 1994 | 22.0% | .. | .. | Yes | No |
| Ethiopia | 5.9% | 0% | 2005 | 21.2% | 2005 | 8.3% | No | Yes |
| Gambia | 20.0% | 8% | 2002 | 13.2% | .. | .. | No | No |
| Guinea | 15.4% | 0% | 2002 | 19.3% | .. | .. | No | No |
| Guinea-Bissau | 37.5% | 20% | 2004 | 14.0% | .. | .. | No | No |
| Haiti | 25.0% | 0% | 2000 | 3.6% | 2000 | 25.9% | No | No |
| Kiribati | .. | .. | 2003 | 4.8% | .. | .. | No | Yes |
| Lao People´s Democratic Republic | 0.0% | 6% | 2002 | 22.9% | .. | .. | No | No |
| Lesotho | 27.8% | 0% | 2002 | 11.7% | .. | 36.4% | No | Yes |
| Liberia | .. | .. | 2003 | 5.3% | .. | .. | Yes | No |
| Madagascar | 5.9% | 7% | 2002 | 6.9% | 2001 | 11.1% | No | No |
| Malawi | 14.3% | 10% | 2004 | 13.6% | .. | .. | No | No |
| Maldives | 11.8% | 6% | 2005 | 12.0% | .. | .. | No | No |
| Mali | 18.5% | 0% | 2002 | 10.2% | .. | .. | No | No |
| Mauritania | 9.1% | 0% | .. | .. | .. | .. | No | No |
| Mozambique | 13.0% | 16% | 2004 | 34.8% | .. | .. | No | No |
| Myanmar | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | No | No |
| Nepal | 7.4% | 6% | 1999 | 5.9% | 2001 | 8.3% | Yes | No |
| Niger | 23.1% | 5% | 2004 | 12.4% | .. | .. | Yes | Yes |
| Rwanda | 35.7% | 17% | 2003 | 48.8% | 2003 | 34.6% | Yes | No |
| Samoa | 7.7% | 0% | 2001 | 6.1% | .. | .. | No | Yes |
| São Tomé and Principe | 14.3% | 12% | 2002 | 9.1% | .. | .. | No | No |
| Senegal | 20.6% | 13% | 2001 | 19.2% | .. | .. | No | No |
| Sierra Leone | 13.0% | 0% | 2002 | 14.5% | .. | .. | No | No |
| Solomon Islands | 0.0% | 0% | 2001 | 0.0% | .. | .. | No | No |
| Somalia | .. | .. | 2004 | .. | .. | .. | No | No |
| Sudan | 2.6% | 0% | 2000 | 9.7% | .. | .. | Yes | No |
| Timor-Leste | 22.2% | 0% | 2001 | 25.3% | .. | .. | No | No |
| Togo | 20.0% | 5% | 2002 | 7.4% | .. | .. | No | No |

CONTINUES

| Countries | Women in government at ministerial level (% of total) | Women in parliament (% of total) Lower or single house | | | Upper house or senate | | Quotas (in parliament, political parties and government by law), for women and other categories | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2005 | 1990 | Most recent election | | Most recent election | | Gender | Ethnic |
| Tuvalu | .. | .. | 2002 | .. | .. | .. | No | No |
| Uganda | 23.4% | 12% | 2001 | 23.9% | .. | .. | Yes | No |
| United Republic of Tanzania | 15.4% | 0% | 2000 | 21.4% | .. | .. | Yes | No |
| Vanuatu | 8.3% | 4% | 2004 | 3.8% | .. | .. | No | No |
| Yemen | 2.9% | 4% | 2003 | 0.3% | 2003 | .. | No | No |
| Zambia | 25.0% | 7% | 2001 | 12.7% | .. | .. | No | No |
| World | 10.1% | (a) | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | |
| Least developed countries | 11.3% | (a) | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | |
| Developing countries | 8.4% | (a) | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | |
| Low income | 7.0% | (a) | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | |
| Low human development | 12.1% | (a) | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | |
| Medium human development | 7.6% | (a) | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | |
| Middle income | 9.2% | (a) | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | |
| High human development | 18.3% | (a) | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | |
| High income | 20.4% | (a) | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | |
| High income OECD | 20.7% | (a) | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | |

Notes: (a) 2004 population estimates used as weights.

*Sources: Columns 1-2 UNDP (2005a) and World Bank (2005a); columns 3-4 IPU (2005c); columns 5-7 Htun (2004) and IDEA (2005b).*

# Afghanistan

■ = MDG

## COUNTRY OVERVIEW

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2005 | Population (In millions) | 28.5 | |
| 2005 | Population density (per sq km) | 46.0 | |
| 2005 | Urban population (% of total population) | 24.3% | |
| ■ 2001 | Slum population as percentage of urban population | 99% | |
| 2005 | Population female (% of total) | 48.4% | |
| 2004 | Age dependency ratio (dependents to working-age population) | | 0.89 |
| Indebtedness | | Not classified | |
| Independence date | | 1919 | |

| Committee for Development Policy LDC criteria | Inclusion | Graduation |
|---|---|---|
| Gap to threshold in % of current GNI per capita (US$) | -43.4% | -72.1% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current HAI score | -374.1% | -425.9% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current EVI score | -26.1% | -34.1% |

| MDGs progress | 1990-2000 |
|---|---|
| ■ MDG Hunger | Reversal/stagnation |
| ■ MDG Primary education | .. |
| ■ MDG Gender equality in education | .. |
| ■ MDG Child mortality | Reversal/stagnation |
| ■ MDG Access to water | .. |

## WELL-BEING

| Health | 1990 | 2003 |
|---|---|---|
| Life expectancy at birth (years, male and female combined) | 41.5 | 42.0 |
| Fertility rate (births per woman) | 6.9 | 6.8 |
| ■ Under five mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) | 260 | 257 |
| | 1993-1998 | 1999-2004 |
| Physicians (per 1,000) | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| ■ Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total) | .. | 14.0% |

| Education | 2000-2004 | |
|---|---|---|
| Legal guarantee of primary free education | .. | |
| Adult literacy (% of people ages 15 and above) | .. | |
| ■ Youth literacy (% age 15-24) | .. | |
| Ratio of literate females to literate males (ages 15 and above) | .. | |
| Ratio of literate females to males (ages 15-24) | .. | |
| | 1999/2000 | 2002/2003 |
| School enrolment primary (% gross) | 29% | 92% |
| Pupil-teacher ratio primary | 36% | 61% |
| School enrolment secondary (% gross) | .. | 12% |

| Public responsibility | 2002-2004 | |
|---|---|---|
| Public expenditure on health (% of GDP) | 0.5% | 3.1% |
| General government expenditure on health (% of total government expenditure) | 9.0% | 23.1% |
| Out-of-pocket expenditure on health (% of total health expenditure) | 91.4% | 48.6% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of GDP) | .. | .. |
| Public expenditure on education (% of government expenditure) | .. | .. |
| Military expenditure (% of GDP) | .. | .. |
| Military expenditure (% of government final consumption) | .. | .. |
| Prison data and justice | 1990-1995 | 1996-2005 |
| Prison population rates (per 100,000) | .. | .. |
| Pre-trial detainees (% of prison population) | .. | |

## ECONOMY

| Economic overview | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| HDI | .. | .. |
| GDP per capita (constant international US$ at PPP) | .. | .. |
| Gross domestic savings (% of GDP) | .. | -16.3% |
| Gross fixed capital formation (% of GDP) | .. | .. |
| Net foreign direct investment inflows (as % of GDP) | .. | .. |
| Inflation consumer prices (annual %) | .. | .. |

| Economic overview (continued) | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| General government final consumption expenditure (% of GDP) | .. | .. |
| Agricultural labour force (% of total labour force) | 70%(a) | 66% |
| Military personnel (% of total labour force) | 0.5%(b) | .. |
| **Debt and aid** | | |
| External debt per capita (DOD constant 2000 US$) | .. | .. |
| ■ Debt service total (% of exports) | .. | .. |
| Aid per capita (constant 2000 US$) | 12.3(b) | .. |
| Aid (% of GNI) | .. | 33.4% |
| 2005 HIPC initiative (decision point/completion point) | .. | |
| **International trade** | | |
| Trade (% of GDP) | .. | 145.6% |
| Food exports (% of merchandise exports) | .. | 24.6% |
| Food imports (% of merchandise imports) | .. | 6.3% |
| Manufactures exports (% of merchandise exports) | .. | 10.7% |
| Manufactures imports (% of merchandise imports) | 28.7%(c) | 28.5% |
| Fuel exports (% of merchandise exports) | .. | .. |
| Fuel imports (% of merchandise imports) | .. | 4.9% |
| **Information and communication technology** | | |
| ■ Fixed line and mobile phone subscribers (per 1,000) | 1.5 | 11.8 |
| Television sets (per 1,000) | 10.2 | 14.2(d) |
| 2004 Total number of permanent post offices (per 100,000) | 1.4 | |
| Daily newspapers (per 1,000) | .. | |
| **Poverty and inequality** | | |
| National Gini index | .. | |
| ■ Living on less than $1 a day (PPP) (% of population) | .. | |
| ■ Living on less than $2 a day (PPP) (% of population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at national poverty line (% of population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at rural poverty line (% of rural population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at urban poverty line (% of urban population) | .. | |
| HPI-1 rank – income poverty rank | .. | |
| HDI rank – GDI rank | .. | |

**GOVERNANCE**

| Parliamentary development | |
|---|---|
| Lower or single house | Wolesi Jirga |
| Upper house or senate | Meshrano Jirga |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Lower or single house | 9/18/05 |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Upper house or senate | .. |
| Parliamentary term in lower or single house (years) | 5 |
| Parliamentarian obligation to declare personal assets | No |
| **Participation** | |
| Ratio of voters to registered voters (parliamentary) | .. |
| Ratio of voters to registered voters (presidential) | .. |
| Year women received right to vote | 1963 |
| Year women received right to stand for election | 1963 |
| Parliamentary bodies dealing with human rights | .. |

| Aggregate indicators | | |
|---|---|---|
| World Bank governance indicators | 1996 | 2004 |
| Voice and accountability | -1.5 | -1.4 |
| Political stability | -1.8 | -2.0 |
| Government effectiveness | -1.3(c) | -1.2 |
| Regulatory quality | -3.6(c) | -2.0 |
| Rule of law | -1.2 | -1.8 |
| Control of corruption | -1.6(c) | -1.3 |

| ENVIRONMENT | 1990-1995 | 2000-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| ■ Proportion of land area covered by forest (%) | 2.1% | 2.1% |
| ■ Ratio of protected area to surface area | 0% | 0% |
| ■ Carbon dioxide emissions (metric tons per capita) | 0.1 | 0.0 |

Notes: (a) 1990; (b) 1994; (c) 2000; (d) 2001.

# Angola

■ = MDG

## COUNTRY OVERVIEW

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2004 | Population (In millions) | 14.0 | |
| 2004 | Population density (per sq km) | 11.2 | |
| 2004 | Urban population (% of total population) | 36.5% | |
| 2001 | Slum population as percentage of urban population | 83% | |
| 2004 | Population female (% of total) | 50.6% | |
| 2004 | Age dependency ratio (dependents to working-age population) | | 1.03 |
| | Indebtedness | Severely indebted | |
| | Independence date | 1975 | |

| **Committee for Development Policy LDC criteria** | **Inclusion** | **Graduation** |
|---|---|---|
| Gap to threshold in % of current GNI per capita (US$) | -67.8% | -101.3% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current HAI score | -114.8% | -138.3% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current EVI score | -23.7% | -32.0% |

| **MDGs progress** | 1990-2000 |
|---|---|
| ■ MDG Hunger | Achievable by 2015 |
| ■ MDG Primary education | .. |
| ■ MDG Gender equality in education | .. |
| ■ MDG Child mortality | Reversal/stagnation |
| ■ MDG Access to water | .. |

## WELL-BEING

| **Health** | **1990** | **2003** |
|---|---|---|
| Life expectancy at birth (years, male and female combined) | 45.5 | 46.7 |
| Fertility rate (births per woman) | 7.2 | 7.0 |
| ■ Under five mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) | 260 | 260 |
| | 1993-1998 | 1999-2004 |
| Physicians (per 1,000) | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| ■ Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total) | 22.5% | 44.7% |

| **Education** | **2000-2004** | |
|---|---|---|
| Legal guarantee of primary free education | Free education guaranteed | |
| Adult literacy (% of people ages 15 and above) | 66.8% | |
| Youth literacy (% age 15-24) | 71.4% | |
| Ratio of literate females to literate males (ages 15 and above) | 65.5% | |
| Ratio of literate females to males (ages 15-24) | 75.7% | |
| | 1999/2000 | 2002/2003 |
| ■ School enrolment primary (% gross) | 74% | .. |
| Pupil-teacher ratio primary | 42%(a) | .. |
| School enrolment secondary (% gross) | 15% | 19%(b) |

| **Public responsibility** | 1999 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| Public expenditure on health (% of GDP) | 1.3% | 2.1% |
| General government expenditure on health (% of total government expenditure) | 2.1% | 4.1% |
| Out-of-pocket expenditure on health (% of total health expenditure) | 58.6% | 58.1% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of GDP) | 2.3% | 2.8%(b) |
| Public expenditure on education (% of government expenditure) | .. | .. |
| Military expenditure (% of GDP) | 21.4% | 4.7% |
| Military expenditure (% of government final consumption) | .. | .. |
| Prison data and justice | 1990-1995 | 1996-2005 |
| Prison population rates (per 100,000) | .. | 44 |
| 2003 Pre-trial detainees (% of prison population) | 58.9% | |

## ECONOMY

| **Economic overview** | **1995** | **2002-2004** |
|---|---|---|
| HDI | .. | 0.445 |
| GDP per capita (constant international US$ at PPP) | 1782.7 | 2135.8 |
| Gross domestic savings (% of GDP) | 26.1%(c) | 36.7% |
| Gross fixed capital formation (% of GDP) | 30.5%(c) | 11.6% |
| Net foreign direct investment inflows (as % of GDP) | 9.4% | 10.2% |
| Inflation consumer prices (annual %) | 2671.8% | 40.4% |

| Economic overview (continued) | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| General government final consumption expenditure (% of GDP) | 40.1%(c) | .. |
| Agricultural labour force (% of total labour force) | 75%(d) | 71% |
| Military personnel (% of total labour force) | 2.4% | 2.1% |
| **Debt and aid** | | |
| External debt per capita (DOD constant 2000 US$) | 1149.2 | 677.6 |
| ■ Debt service total (% of exports) | 12.0% | 13.7% |
| Aid per capita (constant 2000 US$) | 41.8 | 34.8 |
| Aid (% of GNI) | 11.3% | 4.2% |
| 2005 HIPC initiative (decision point/completion point) | .. | |
| **International trade** | | |
| Trade (% of GDP) | 161.2%(e) | 138.1% |
| Food exports (% of merchandise exports) | 0.3%(f) | 65.5%(g) |
| Food imports (% of merchandise imports) | .. | .. |
| Manufactures exports (% of merchandise exports) | 0.0%(f) | 13.9% |
| Manufactures imports (% of merchandise imports) | .. | .. |
| Fuel exports (% of merchandise exports) | 94.8%(f) | 3.0%(g) |
| Fuel imports (% of merchandise imports) | .. | .. |
| **Information and communication technology** | | |
| ■ Fixed line and mobile phone subscribers (per 1,000) | 5.1 | 15.4 |
| Television sets (per 1,000) | 7.4 | 20.1 |
| 2004 Total number of permanent post offices (per 100,000) | 0.4 | |
| 1998 Daily newspapers (per 1,000) | 11.3 | |
| **Poverty and inequality** | | |
| National Gini index | .. | |
| ■ Living on less than $1 a day (PPP) (% of population) | .. | |
| ■ Living on less than $2 a day (PPP) (% of population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at national poverty line (% of population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at rural poverty line (% of rural population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at urban poverty line (% of urban population) | .. | |
| HPI-1 rank – income poverty rank | .. | |
| 2003 HDI rank – GDI rank | 0 | |

**GOVERNANCE**

| Parliamentary development | |
|---|---|
| Lower or single house | Assembleia Nacional |
| Upper house or senate | .. |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Lower or single house | 9/30/92 |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Upper house or senate | .. |
| Parliamentary term in lower or single house (years) | 4 |
| Parliamentarian obligation to declare personal assets | No |
| **Participation** | |
| Ratio of voters to registered voters (parliamentary) | 91.2% |
| Ratio of voters to registered voters (presidential) | 91.2% |
| Year women received right to vote | 1975 |
| Year women received right to stand for election | 1975 |
| 1993 Parliamentary bodies dealing with human rights | Committee on Human Rights and Citizens' Petitions and Suggestions |

| Aggregate indicators | | |
|---|---|---|
| World Bank governance indicators | 1996 | 2004 |
| Voice and accountability | -1.4 | -1.0 |
| Political stability | -2.2 | -0.9 |
| Government effectiveness | -1.1 | -1.1 |
| Regulatory quality | -1.6 | -1.4 |
| Rule of law | -1.4 | -1.3 |
| Control of corruption | -1.0 | -1.1 |

| ENVIRONMENT | 1990-1995 | 2000-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| ■ Proportion of land area covered by forest (%) | 56.9% | 56.0% |
| ■ Ratio of protected area to surface area | 12% | 12% |
| ■ Carbon dioxide emissions (metric tons per capita) | 0.9 | 0.5 |

Notes:(a) 1998/1999; (b) 2001/2002; (c) 1994; (d) 1990; (e) 1996; (f) 1991; (g) 2000.

# Bangladesh

■ = MDG

| COUNTRY OVERVIEW | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2004 | Population (In millions) | 140.5 | |
| 2004 | Population density (per sq km) | 1,079.3 | |
| 2004 | Urban population (% of total population) | 24.6% | |
| ■ 2001 | Slum population as percentage of urban population | 85% | |
| 2004 | Population female (% of total) | 49.8% | |
| 2004 | Age dependency ratio (dependents to working-age population) | | 0.61 |
| Indebtedness | | Less indebted | |
| Independence date | | 1971 | |

| Committee for Development Policy LDC criteria | Inclusion | Graduation |
|---|---|---|
| Gap to threshold in % of current GNI per capita (US$) | -106.6% | -147.9% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current HAI score | -21.4% | -34.7% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current EVI score | 61.6% | 44.1% |

| MDGs progress | 1990-2000 |
|---|---|
| ■ MDG Hunger | Reversal/stagnation |
| ■ MDG Primary education | Achievable by 2015 |
| ■ MDG Gender equality in education | Achieved |
| ■ MDG Child mortality | Achievable by 2015 |
| ■ MDG Access to water | Achieved |

## WELL-BEING

| Health | 1990 | 2003 |
|---|---|---|
| Life expectancy at birth (years, male and female combined) | 54.8 | 62.4 |
| Fertility rate (births per woman) | 4.1 | 2.9 |
| ■ Under five mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) | 144 | 69 |
| | 1993-1998 | 1999-2004 |
| Physicians (per 1,000) | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| ■ Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total) | 8.0% | 14.0% |

| Education | 2000-2004 | |
|---|---|---|
| Legal guarantee of primary free education | Free education guaranteed | |
| Adult literacy (% of people ages 15 and above) | 41.1% | |
| Youth literacy (% age 15-24) | 49.7% | |
| Ratio of literate females to literate males (ages 15 and above) | 62.4% | |
| Ratio of literate females to males (ages 15-24) | 71.1% | |
| | 1999/2000 | 2002/2003 |
| ■ School enrolment primary (% gross) | 100% | 96% |
| Pupil-teacher ratio primary | 56% | 56% |
| School enrolment secondary (% gross) | 45% | 47% |

| Public responsibility | 1999 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| Public expenditure on health (% of GDP) | 0.9% | 0.8% |
| General government expenditure on health (% of total government expenditure) | 4.7% | 4.4% |
| Out-of-pocket expenditure on health (% of total health expenditure) | 64.6% | 64.3% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of GDP) | 2.4% | 2.4% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of government expenditure) | 15.0% | 15.5% |
| Military expenditure (% of GDP) | 1.4% | 1.2% |
| Military expenditure (% of government final consumption) | 28.7% | 18.6% |
| Prison data and justice | 1990-1995 | 1996-2005 |
| Prison population rates (per 100,000) | 36 | 50 |
| 2004 Pre-trial detainees (% of prison population) | 60.3% | |

| Economy | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| HDI | 0.452 | 0.52 |
| GDP per capita (constant international US$ at PPP) | 1319.5 | 1735.3 |
| Gross domestic savings (% of GDP) | 12.6% | 17.0% |
| Gross fixed capital formation (% of GDP) | 19.1% | 23.4% |
| Net foreign direct investment inflows (as % of GDP) | 0.0% | 0.2% |
| Inflation consumer prices (annual %) | 10.2% | 3.2% |
| General government final consumption expenditure (% of GDP) | 4.6% | 5.4% |

| Economic overview (continued) | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| Agricultural labour force (% of total labour force) | 65%(a) | 54% |
| Military personnel (% of total labour force) | 0.3% | 0.3% |
| **Debt and aid** | | |
| External debt per capita (DOD constant 2000 US$) | 143.9 | 128.5 |
| ■ Debt service total (% of exports) | 13.2% | 5.9% |
| Aid per capita (constant 2000 US$) | 11.7 | 9.5 |
| Aid (% of GNI) | 3.3% | 2.5% |
| 2005 HIPC initiative (decision point/completion point) | .. | |
| **International trade** | | |
| Trade (% of GDP) | 28.2% | 34.6% |
| Food exports (% of merchandise exports) | 10.4% | 7.7% |
| Food imports (% of merchandise imports) | 17.3% | 19.8% |
| Manufactures exports (% of merchandise exports) | 85.2% | 89.5% |
| Manufactures imports (% of merchandise imports) | 69.1% | 62.8% |
| Fuel exports (% of merchandise exports) | 0.4% | 0.6% |
| Fuel imports (% of merchandise imports) | 7.7% | 7.7% |
| **Information and communication technology** | | |
| ■ Fixed line and mobile phone subscribers (per 1,000) | 2.4 | 15.6 |
| Television sets (per 1,000) | 18.8 | 61.5 |
| 2004 Total number of permanent post offices (per 100,000) | 7.1 | |
| Daily newspapers (per 1,000) | .. | |
| **Poverty and inequality** | | |
| 2000 National Gini index | 31.8 | |
| MDG 2000 Living on less than $1 a day (PPP) (% of population) | 36.0% | |
| MDG 2000 Living on less than $2 a day (PPP) (% of population) | 82.8% | |
| 2000 Poverty rate at national poverty line (% of population) | 49.8% | |
| 2000 Poverty rate at rural poverty line (% of rural population) | 53.0% | |
| 2000 Poverty rate at urban poverty line (% of urban population) | 36.6% | |
| 2003 HPI-1 rank – income poverty rank | 5 | |
| 2003 HDI rank – GDI rank | 2 | |
| **GOVERNANCE** | | |
| **Parliamentary development** | | |
| Lower or single house | Jatiya Sangsad | |
| Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Lower or single house | 10/1/01 | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Parliamentary term in lower or single house (years) | 5 | |
| Parliamentarian obligation to declare personal assets | No | |
| **Participation** | | |
| 2001 Ratio of voters to registered voters (parliamentary) | 75.0% | |
| 1986 Ratio of voters to registered voters (presidential) | 54.1% | |
| Year women received right to vote | 1972 | |
| Year women received right to stand for election | 1972 | |
| Parliamentary bodies dealing with human rights | .. | |
| **Aggregate indicators** | | |
| World Bank governance indicators | 1996 | 2004 |
| Voice and accountability | -0.3 | -0.7 |
| Political stability | -0.5 | -1.2 |
| Government effectiveness | -0.7 | -0.7 |
| Regulatory quality | -0.5 | -1.1 |
| Rule of law | -0.7 | -0.9 |
| Control of corruption | -0.5 | -1.1 |
| **ENVIRONMENT** | **1990-1995** | **2000-2004** |
| ■ Proportion of land area covered by forest (%) | 9.0% | 10.2% |
| ■ Ratio of protected area to surface area | 1% | 1% |
| ■ Carbon dioxide emissions (metric tons per capita) | 0.2 | 0.3 |

Notes:(a) 1990.

# Benin

■ = MDG

## COUNTRY OVERVIEW

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2004 | Population (In millions) | 6.9 | |
| 2004 | Population density (per sq km) | 62.3 | |
| 2004 | Urban population (% of total population) | 45.3% | |
| ■ 2001 | Slum population as percentage of urban population | 84% | |
| 2004 | Population female (% of total) | 50.8% | |
| 2004 | Age dependency ratio (dependents to working-age population) | | 0.89 |
| Indebtedness | | Moderately indebted | |
| Independence date | | 1960 | |

| Committee for Development Policy LDC criteria | Inclusion | Graduation |
|---|---|---|
| Gap to threshold in % of current GNI per capita (US$) | -104.4% | -145.2% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current HAI score | -36.8% | -51.7% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current EVI score | -35.1% | -42.1% |

| MDGs progress | 1990-2000 |
|---|---|
| ■ MDG Hunger | Achievable by 2015 |
| ■ MDG Primary education | Achievable by 2015 |
| ■ MDG Gender equality in education | .. |
| ■ MDG Child mortality | Low progress |
| ■ MDG Access to water | .. |

## WELL-BEING

| Health | 1990 | 2003 |
|---|---|---|
| Life expectancy at birth (years, male and female combined) | 51.9 | 53.0 |
| Fertility rate (births per woman) | 6.6 | 5.2 |
| ■ Under five mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) | 185 | 154 |
| | 1993-1998 | 1999-2004 |
| Physicians (per 1,000) | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| ■ Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total) | 59.8% | 65.5% |

| Education | 2000-2004 | |
|---|---|---|
| Legal guarantee of primary free education | Progressive realization or partial guarantees | |
| Adult literacy (% of people ages 15 and above) | 33.6% | |
| Youth literacy (% age 15-24) | 44.4% | |
| Ratio of literate females to literate males (ages 15 and above) | 48.8% | |
| Ratio of literate females to males (ages 15-24) | 55.9% | |
| | 1999/2000 | 2002/2003 |
| ■ School enrolment primary (% gross) | 87% | 109% |
| Pupil-teacher ratio primary | 53% | 62% |
| School enrolment secondary (% gross) | 22% | 28% |

| Public responsibility | 1999 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| Public expenditure on health (% of GDP) | 1.6% | 2.1% |
| General government expenditure on health (% of total government expenditure) | 9.0% | 11.1% |
| Out-of-pocket expenditure on health (% of total health expenditure) | 57.3% | 50.2% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of GDP) | 2.5% | 3.3% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of government expenditure) | .. | .. |
| Military expenditure (% of GDP) | 1.8%(a) | .. |
| Military expenditure (% of government final consumption) | .. | .. |
| Prison data and justice | 1990-1995 | 1996-2005 |
| Prison population rates (per 100,000) | .. | 81 |
| 1999 Pre-trial detainees (% of prison population) | 64.5% | |

## ECONOMY

| Economic overview | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| HDI | 0.395 | 0.431 |
| GDP per capita (constant international US$ at PPP) | 867.6 | 1043.2 |
| Gross domestic savings (% of GDP) | 6.7% | -1.3% |
| Gross fixed capital formation (% of GDP) | 17.2% | 20.3% |
| Net foreign direct investment inflows (as % of GDP) | 0.4% | 1.4% |
| Inflation consumer prices (annual %) | 14.5% | 0.9% |

| Economic overview (continued) | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| General government final consumption expenditure (% of GDP) | 11.2% | 13.6% |
| Agricultural labour force (% of total labour force) | 64%(a) | 52% |
| Military personnel (% of total labour force) | 0.3% | 0.2% |
| **Debt and aid** | | |
| External debt per capita (DOD constant 2000 US$) | 320.4 | 257.0 |
| ■ Debt service total (% of exports) | 6.8% | 6.9% |
| Aid per capita (constant 2000 US$) | 55.7 | 41.3 |
| Aid (% of GNI) | 14.3% | 8.3% |
| 2005 HIPC initiative (decision point/completion point) | Country has reached completion point | |
| **International trade** | | |
| Trade (% of GDP) | 53.2% | 39.6% |
| Food exports (% of merchandise exports) | 14.1% | 32.8% |
| Food imports (% of merchandise imports) | 27.3% | 23.9% |
| Manufactures exports (% of merchandise exports) | 5.6% | 7.6% |
| Manufactures imports (% of merchandise imports) | 59.4% | 52.3% |
| Fuel exports (% of merchandise exports) | 5.4% | 0.2% |
| Fuel imports (% of merchandise imports) | 9.4% | 17.4% |
| **Information and communication technology** | | |
| ■ Fixed line and mobile phone subscribers (per 1,000) | 5.4 | 43.1 |
| Television sets (per 1,000) | 19.4 | 33.8 |
| 2004 Total number of permanent post offices (per 100,000) | 2.6 | |
| 1999 Daily newspapers (per 1,000) | 5.4 | |
| **Poverty and inequality** | | |
| National Gini index | .. | |
| ■ Living on less than $1 a day (PPP) (% of population) | .. | |
| ■ Living on less than $2 a day (PPP) (% of population) | .. | |
| 1999 Poverty rate at national poverty line (% of population) | 29.0% | |
| 1999 Poverty rate at rural poverty line (% of rural population) | 33.0% | |
| 1999 Poverty rate at urban poverty line (% of urban population) | 23.3% | |
| HPI-1 rank – income poverty rank | .. | |
| 2003 HDI rank – GDI rank | 0 | |
| **GOVERNANCE** | | |
| **Parliamentary development** | | |
| Lower or single house | Assemblée Nationale | |
| Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Lower or single house | 3/30/03 | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Parliamentary term in lower or single house (years) | 4 | |
| Parliamentarian obligation to declare personal assets | No | |
| **Participation** | | |
| 1999 Ratio of voters to registered voters (parliamentary) | 70.1% | |
| 1996 Ratio of voters to registered voters (presidential) | 77.8% | |
| Year women received right to vote | 1956 | |
| Year women received right to stand for election | 1956 | |
| 1995 Parliamentary bodies dealing with human rights | Committee on Law, Administration and Human Rights | |
| **Aggregate indicators** | | |
| World Bank governance indicators | 1996 | 2004 |
| Voice and accountability | 0.7 | 0.3 |
| Political stability | 1.2 | -0.4 |
| Government effectiveness | 0.0 | -0.4 |
| Regulatory quality | 0.2 | -0.5 |
| Rule of law | 0.0 | -0.5 |
| Control of corruption | -0.8(b) | -0.3 |
| **ENVIRONMENT** | **1990-1995** | **2000-2004** |
| ■ Proportion of land area covered by forest (%) | 30.3% | 24.0% |
| ■ Ratio of protected area to surface area | 23% | 23% |
| ■ Carbon dioxide emissions (metric tons per capita) | 0.2 | 0.3 |

Notes: (a) 1990; (b) 1998.

# Bhutan

■ = MDG

## COUNTRY OVERVIEW

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2004 | Population (In millions) | 0.9 | |
| 2004 | Population density (per sq km) | 19.1 | |
| 2004 | Urban population (% of total population) | 8.8% | |
| ■2001 | Slum population as percentage of urban population | 44% | |
| 2004 | Population female (% of total) | 49.5% | |
| 2004 | Age dependency ratio (dependents to working-age population) | | 0.87 |
| Indebtedness | | Severely indebted | |
| Independence date | | 1949 | |

| Committee for Development Policy LDC criteria | Inclusion | Graduation |
|---|---|---|
| Gap to threshold in % of current GNI per capita (US$) | -25.0% | -50.0% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current HAI score | -36.1% | -51.0% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current EVI score | -8.9% | -18.7% |

| MDGs progress | 1990-2000 |
|---|---|
| ■ MDG Hunger | .. |
| ■ MDG Primary education | .. |
| ■ MDG Gender equality in education | .. |
| ■ MDG Child mortality | Achievable by 2015 |
| ■ MDG Access to water | .. |

## WELL-BEING

| Health | 1990 | 2003 |
|---|---|---|
| Life expectancy at birth (years, male and female combined) | 57.7(a) | 63.5 |
| Fertility rate (births per woman) | 5.9(a) | 5.1 |
| ■ Under five mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) | 166 | 85 |
| | 1993-1998 | 1999-2004 |
| Physicians (per 1,000) | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| ■ Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total) | 14.9%(b) | 23.7% |

| Education | 2000-2004 | |
|---|---|---|
| Legal guarantee of primary free education | Free education guaranteed | |
| Adult literacy (% of people ages 15 and above) | .. | |
| Youth literacy (% age 15-24) | .. | |
| Ratio of literate females to literate males (ages 15 and above) | .. | |
| Ratio of literate females to males (ages 15-24) | .. | |
| | 1999/2000 | 2002/2003 |
| ■ School enrolment primary (% gross) | .. | .. |
| Pupil-teacher ratio primary | 42% | 38% |
| School enrolment secondary (% gross) | .. | .. |

| Public responsibility | 1999 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| Public expenditure on health (% of GDP) | 3.1% | 4.1% |
| General government expenditure on health (% of total government expenditure) | 8.3% | 12.0% |
| Out-of-pocket expenditure on health (% of total health expenditure) | 10.4% | 7.8% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of GDP) | 5.2% | 5.2%(c) |
| Public expenditure on education (% of government expenditure) | 13.8% | 12.9%(c) |
| Military expenditure (% of GDP) | .. | .. |
| Military expenditure (% of government final consumption) | .. | .. |
| Prison data and justice | 1990-1995 | 1996-2005 |
| Prison population rates (per 100,000) | .. | .. |
| Pre-trial detainees (% of prison population) | .. | |

## ECONOMY

| Economic overview | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| HDI | .. | 0.536 |
| GDP per capita (constant international US$ at PPP) | .. | .. |
| Gross domestic savings (% of GDP) | 42.1% | 32.4% |
| Gross fixed capital formation (% of GDP) | 44.6% | 53.5% |
| Net foreign direct investment inflows (as % of GDP) | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Inflation consumer prices (annual %) | 9.5% | 1.6% |

| Economic overview (continued) | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| General government final consumption expenditure (% of GDP) | 23.8% | 18.4% |
| Agricultural labour force (% of total labour force) | 94%(b) | 94% |
| Military personnel (% of total labour force) | 1.2% | 1.6%(d) |
| **Debt and aid** | | |
| External debt per capita (DOD constant 2000 US$) | 165.3 | 456.2 |
| ■ Debt service total (% of exports) | 10.9% | 4.6% |
| Aid per capita (constant 2000 US$) | 112.2 | 83.3 |
| Aid (% of GNI) | 26.3% | 12.8% |
| 2005 HIPC initiative (decision point/completion point) | .. | |
| **International trade** | | |
| Trade (% of GDP) | 78.5% | 64.6% |
| Food exports (% of merchandise exports) | 23.3%(e) | 13.3%(f) |
| Food imports (% of merchandise imports) | 21.5%(e) | 17.9%(f) |
| Manufactures exports (% of merchandise exports) | 40.1%(e) | 39.9%(f) |
| Manufactures imports (% of merchandise imports) | 63.8%(e) | 69.6%(f) |
| Fuel exports (% of merchandise exports) | 25.6%(e) | 41.9%(f) |
| Fuel imports (% of merchandise imports) | 11.4%(e) | 10.4%(f) |
| **Information and communication technology** | | |
| ■ Fixed line and mobile phone subscribers (per 1,000) | 9.0 | 45.2 |
| Television sets (per 1,000) | 17.2 | 29.0 |
| 2004 Total number of permanent post offices (per 100,000) | 12.3 | |
| Daily newspapers (per 1,000) | .. | |
| **Poverty and inequality** | | |
| National Gini index | .. | |
| ■ Living on less than $1 a day (PPP) (% of population) | .. | |
| ■ Living on less than $2 a day (PPP) (% of population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at national poverty line (% of population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at rural poverty line (% of rural population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at urban poverty line (% of urban population) | .. | |
| HPI-1 rank – income poverty rank | .. | |
| HDI rank – GDI rank | .. | |
| **GOVERNANCE** | | |
| **Parliamentary development** | | |
| Lower or single house | Tshogdu | |
| Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Lower or single house | .. | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Parliamentary term in lower or single house (years) | 3 | |
| Parliamentarian obligation to declare personal assets | No | |
| **Participation** | | |
| Ratio of voters to registered voters (parliamentary) | .. | |
| Ratio of voters to registered voters (presidential) | .. | |
| Year women received right to vote | 1953 | |
| Year women received right to stand for election | 1953 | |
| Parliamentary bodies dealing with human rights | .. | |
| **Aggregate indicators** | | |
| World Bank governance indicators | 1996 | 2004 |
| Voice and accountability | -1.4 | -1.2 |
| Political stability | 1.0 | 0.8 |
| Government effectiveness | 0.3 | -0.1 |
| Regulatory quality | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Rule of law | -1.2 | 0.3 |
| Control of corruption | 0.5(g) | 0.7 |
| **ENVIRONMENT** | **1990-1995** | **2000-2004** |
| ■ Proportion of land area covered by forest (%) | 64.2% | 64.2% |
| ■ Ratio of protected area to surface area | 25% | 26% |
| ■ Carbon dioxide emissions (metric tons per capita) | 0.1 | 0.2 |

Notes: (a) 1992; (b) 1990; (c) 2000/2001; (d) 2000; (e) 1994; (f) 1999; (g) 1998.

# Burkina Faso

■ = MDG

## COUNTRY OVERVIEW

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2004 | Population (In millions) | 12.4 | |
| 2004 | Population density (per sq km) | 45.3 | |
| 2004 | Urban population (% of total population) | 18.2% | |
| ■ 2001 | Slum population as percentage of urban population | 77% | |
| 2004 | Population female (% of total) | 50.4% | |
| 2004 | Age dependency ratio (dependents to working-age population) | | 0.98 |
| Indebtedness | | Moderately indebted | |
| Independence date | | 1960 | |

| Committee for Development Policy LDC criteria | Inclusion | Graduation |
|---|---|---|
| Gap to threshold in % of current GNI per capita (US$) | -245.6% | -314.7% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current HAI score | -107.5% | -130.2% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current EVI score | -24.9% | -33.1% |
| MDGs progress | 1990-2000 | |
| ■ MDG Hunger | Reversal/stagnation | |
| ■ MDG Primary education | Low progress | |
| ■ MDG Gender equality in education | Low progress | |
| ■ MDG Child mortality | Low progress | |
| ■ MDG Access to water | .. | |

## WELL-BEING

| Health | 1990 | 2003 |
|---|---|---|
| Life expectancy at birth (years, male and female combined) | 45.4 | 42.8 |
| Fertility rate (births per woman) | 7.0 | 6.2 |
| ■ Under five mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) | 210 | 207 |
| | 1993-1998 | 1999-2004 |
| Physicians (per 1,000) | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| ■ Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total) | 41.5% | 31.0% |

| Education | 2000-2004 | |
|---|---|---|
| Legal guarantee of primary free education | Progressive realization or partial guarantees | |
| 1996 Adult literacy (% of people ages 15 and above) | 12.8% | |
| 1996 Youth literacy (% age 15-24) | 19.4% | |
| 1996 Ratio of literate females to literate males (ages 15 and above) | 43.5% | |

| Education | 1996 | |
|---|---|---|
| Ratio of literate females to males (ages 15-24) | 54.9% | |
| | 1999/2000 | 2002/2003 |
| ■ School enrolment primary (% gross) | 42% | 46% |
| Pupil-teacher ratio primary | 49% | 45% |
| School enrolment secondary (% gross) | 10% | 11% |

| Public responsibility | 1999 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| Public expenditure on health (% of GDP) | 1.9% | 2.0% |
| General government expenditure on health (% of total government expenditure) | 8.2% | 10.6% |
| Out-of-pocket expenditure on health (% of total health expenditure) | 57.4% | 53.5% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of GDP) | .. | .. |
| Public expenditure on education (% of government expenditure) | .. | .. |
| Military expenditure (% of GDP) | 1.4% | 1.3% |
| Military expenditure (% of government final consumption) | 11.2% | 11.6% |
| Prison data and justice | 1990-1995 | 1996-2005 |
| Prison population rates (per 100,000) | .. | 23 |
| 2001 Pre-trial detainees (% of prison population) | 58.3% | |

## ECONOMY

| Economic overview | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| HDI | 0.311 | 0.317 |
| GDP per capita (constant international US$ at PPP) | 928.6 | 1126.0 |
| Gross domestic savings (% of GDP) | 8.2% | 4.8% |
| Gross fixed capital formation (% of GDP) | 22.2% | 19.1% |
| Net foreign direct investment inflows (as % of GDP) | 0.4% | 0.3% |

| Economic overview (continued) | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| Inflation consumer prices (annual %) | 7.4% | -0.4% |
| General government final consumption expenditure (% of GDP) | 15.0% | 13.0% |
| Agricultural labour force (% of total labour force) | 92%(a) | 92% |
| Military personnel (% of total labour force) | 0.2% | 0.3% |
| **Debt and aid** | | |
| External debt per capita (DOD constant 2000 US$) | 140.2 | 143.9 |
| ■ Debt service total (% of exports) | 12.2%(b) | 11.2% |
| Aid per capita (constant 2000 US$) | 53.4 | 35.2 |
| Aid (% of GNI) | 20.0% | 10.8% |
| 2005 HIPC initiative (decision point/completion point) | Country has reached completion point | |
| **International trade** | | |
| Trade (% of GDP) | 39.5% | 31.5% |
| Food exports (% of merchandise exports) | 24.7% | 19.6% |
| Food imports (% of merchandise imports) | 21.2% | 21.3% |
| Manufactures exports (% of merchandise exports) | 6.1% | 17.1% |
| Manufactures imports (% of merchandise imports) | 62.0% | 60.3% |
| Fuel exports (% of merchandise exports) | 0.1% | 0.0% |
| Fuel imports (% of merchandise imports) | 14.0% | 16.9% |
| **Information and communication technology** | | |
| ■ Fixed line and mobile phone subscribers (per 1,000) | 3.0 | 23.9 |
| Television sets (per 1,000) | 9.5 | 12.2 |
| 2004 Total number of permanent post offices (per 100,000) | 0.6 | |
| 1998 Daily newspapers (per 1,000) | 1.3 | |
| **Poverty and inequality** | | |
| 1998 National Gini index | 46.7 | |
| ■ 1998 Living on less than $1 a day (PPP) (% of population) | 44.9% | |
| ■ 1998 Living on less than $2 a day (PPP) (% of population) | 81.0% | |
| 1998 Poverty rate at national poverty line (% of population) | 45.3% | |
| 1998 Poverty rate at rural poverty line (% of rural population) | 51.0% | |
| 1998 Poverty rate at urban poverty line (% of urban population) | 16.5% | |
| 2003 HPI-1 rank – income poverty rank | 11 | |
| 2003 HDI rank – GDI rank | 0 | |
| **GOVERNANCE** | | |
| **Parliamentary development** | | |
| Lower or single house | Assemblée Nationale | |
| Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Lower or single house | 5/5/02 | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Upper house or senate | ... | |
| Parliamentary term in lower or single house (years) | 5 | |
| Parliamentarian obligation to declare personal assets | No | |
| **Participation** | | |
| 2002 Ratio of voters to registered voters (parliamentary) | 64.1% | |
| 1998 Ratio of voters to registered voters (presidential) | 56.1% | |
| Year women received right to vote | 1958 | |
| Year women received right to stand for election | 1958 | |
| .. Parliamentary bodies dealing with human rights | Assemblée Nationale | |
| **Aggregate indicators** | | |
| World Bank governance indicators | 1996 | 2004 |
| Voice and accountability | -0.5 | -0.4 |
| Political stability | -0.3 | -0.3 |
| Government effectiveness | -0.8 | -0.5 |
| Regulatory quality | -0.3 | -0.3 |
| Rule of law | -0.8 | -0.6 |
| Control of corruption | -0.3 | -0.3 |
| **ENVIRONMENT** | **1990-1995** | **2000-2004** |
| ■ Proportion of land area covered by forest (%) | 26.5% | 25.9% |
| ■ Ratio of protected area to surface area | 15% | 15% |
| ■ Carbon dioxide emissions (metric tons per capita) | 0.1 | 0.1 |

Notes: (a) 1990; (b) 1994.

# Burundi

■ = MDG

## COUNTRY OVERVIEW

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2004 | Population (In millions) | 7.3 | |
| 2004 | Population density (per sq km) | 285.9 | |
| 2004 | Urban population (% of total population) | 10.3% | |
| ■ 2001 | Slum population as percentage of urban population | 65% | |
| 2004 | Population female (% of total) | 50.8% | |
| 2004 | Age dependency ratio (dependents to working-age population) | | 0.90 |
| Indebtedness | | Severely indebted | |
| Independence date | | 1962 | |

| Committee for Development Policy LDC criteria | Inclusion | Graduation |
|---|---|---|
| Gap to threshold in % of current GNI per capita (US$) | -581.8% | -718.2% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current HAI score | -179.2% | -209.6% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current EVI score | -31.2% | -38.7% |
| MDGs progress | 1990-2000 | |
| ■ MDG Hunger | Reversal/stagnation | |
| ■ MDG Primary education | Low progress | |
| ■ MDG Gender equality in education | Reversal/stagnation | |
| ■ MDG Child mortality | Reversal/stagnation | |
| ■ MDG Access to water | Achievable by 2015 | |

## WELL-BEING

| Health | 1990 | 2003 |
|---|---|---|
| Life expectancy at birth (years, male and female combined) | 43.6 | 41.6 |
| Fertility rate (births per woman) | 6.8 | 5.7 |
| ■ Under five mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) | 190 | 190 |
| | 1993-1998 | 1999-2004 |
| Physicians (per 1,000) | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| ■ Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total) | .. | 25.2% |

| Education | 2000-2004 | |
|---|---|---|
| Legal guarantee of primary free education | No legal guarantee | |
| Adult literacy (% of people ages 15 and above) | 58.9% | |
| Youth literacy (% age 15-24) | 72.3% | |
| Ratio of literate females to literate males (ages 15 and above) | 77.6% | |
| Ratio of literate females to males (ages 15-24) | 91.9% | |
| | 1999/2000 | 2002/2003 |
| ■ School enrolment primary (% gross) | 63% | 77% |
| Pupil-teacher ratio primary | 57% | 50% |
| School enrolment secondary (% gross) | .. | 11% |

| Public responsibility | 1999 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| Public expenditure on health (% of GDP) | 0.6% | 0.6% |
| General government expenditure on health (% of total government expenditure) | 2.1% | 2.0% |
| Out-of-pocket expenditure on health (% of total health expenditure) | 80.1% | 78.5% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of GDP) | 4.1% | 3.9% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of government expenditure) | .. | 13.0% |
| Military expenditure (% of GDP) | 6.3% | 5.9% |
| Military expenditure (% of government final consumption) | 38.2% | 51.7% |
| Prison data and justice | 1990-1995 | 1996-2005 |
| Prison population rates (per 100,000) | .. | 107 |
| 2004 Pre-trial detainees (% of prison population) | 63.4% | |

## ECONOMY

| Economic overview | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| HDI | 0.324 | 0.378 |
| GDP per capita (constant international US$ at PPP) | 693.9 | 624.8 |
| Gross domestic savings (% of GDP) | -4.8% | -5.6% |
| Gross fixed capital formation (% of GDP) | 9.7% | 14.3% |
| Net foreign direct investment inflows (as % of GDP) | 0.2% | 0.0% |
| Inflation consumer prices (annual %) | 19.3% | 7.9% |

| Economic overview (continued) | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| General government final consumption expenditure (% of GDP) | 13.4% | 7.9% |
| Agricultural labour force (% of total labour force) | 92%(a) | 90% |
| Military personnel (% of total labour force) | 0.4% | 1.5% |
| **Debt and aid** | | |
| External debt per capita (DOD constant 2000 US$) | 204.2 | 171.7 |
| ■ Debt service total (% of exports) | 27.6% | 65.8% |
| Aid per capita (constant 2000 US$) | 50.8 | 29.4 |
| Aid (% of GNI) | 29.1% | 39.0% |
| 2005 HIPC initiative (decision point/completion point) | Country still to be considered | |
| **International trade** | | |
| Trade (% of GDP) | 40.2% | 33.4% |
| Food exports (% of merchandise exports) | 91.3% | 93.1% |
| Food imports (% of merchandise imports) | 20.9% | 11.2% |
| Manufactures exports (% of merchandise exports) | 3.4% | 1.9% |
| Manufactures imports (% of merchandise imports) | 64.1% | 71.0% |
| Fuel exports (% of merchandise exports) | 0.0%(b) | .. |
| Fuel imports (% of merchandise imports) | 11.4% | 12.9% |
| **Information and communication technology** | | |
| ■ Fixed line and mobile phone subscribers (per 1,000) | 2.9 | 12.3 |
| Television sets (per 1,000) | 2.5 | 35.1 |
| 2004 Total number of permanent post offices (per 100,000) | 0.4 | |
| 1998 Daily newspapers (per 1,000) | 2.5 | |

| Poverty and inequality | |
|---|---|
| 1998 National Gini index | 42.4 |
| ■ 1998 Living on less than $1 a day (PPP) (% of population) | 54.6% |
| ■ 1998 Living on less than $2 a day (PPP) (% of population) | 87.6% |
| 1990 Poverty rate at national poverty line (% of population) | 36.4% |
| 1990 Poverty rate at rural poverty line (% of rural population) | 36.0% |
| 1990 Poverty rate at urban poverty line (% of urban population) | 43.0% |
| 2003 HPI-1 rank – income poverty rank | -10 |
| 2003 HDI rank – GDI rank | 1 |

## GOVERNANCE

| Parliamentary development | |
|---|---|
| Lower or single house | Inama NshingmateKa |
| Upper house or senate | Sénat |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Lower or single house | 7/4/05 |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Upper house or senate | 7/29/05 |
| Parliamentary term in lower or single house (years) | 5 |
| Parliamentarian obligation to declare personal assets | No |
| **Participation** | |
| 1993 Ratio of voters to registered voters (parliamentary) | 91.4% |
| 1993 Ratio of voters to registered voters (presidential) | 97.3% |
| Year women received right to vote | 1961 |
| Year women received right to stand for election | 1961 |
| 2002 Parliamentary bodies dealing with human rights | Committee on Justice and Human Rights |

| Aggregate indicators | | |
|---|---|---|
| World Bank governance indicators | 1996 | 2004 |
| Voice and accountability | -1.3 | -1.1 |
| Political stability | -1.8 | -2.0 |
| Government effectiveness | -1.0 | -1.2 |
| Regulatory quality | -1.3 | -1.4 |
| Rule of law | -0.2 | -1.5 |
| Control of corruption | -0.8(c) | -1.2 |

| ENVIRONMENT | 1990-1995 | 2000-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| ■ Proportion of land area covered by forest (%) | 9.4% | 3.7% |
| ■ Ratio of protected area to surface area | 5% | 6% |
| ■ Carbon dioxide emissions (metric tons per capita) | 0.0 | 0.0 |

Notes: (a) 1990; (b) 1993; (c) 1998.

# Cambodia

■ = MDG

## COUNTRY OVERVIEW

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2004 | Population (In millions) | 13.6 | |
| 2004 | Population density (per sq km) | 77.2 | |
| 2004 | Urban population (% of total population) | 19.2% | |
| ■ 2001 | Slum population as percentage of urban population | 72% | |
| 2004 | Population female (% of total) | 51.3% | |
| 2004 | Age dependency ratio (dependents to working-age population) | | 0.76 |
| Indebtedness | | Moderately indebted | |
| Independence date | | 1949 | |

| Committee for Development Policy LDC criteria | Inclusion | Graduation |
|---|---|---|
| Gap to threshold in % of current GNI per capita (US$) | -185.2% | -242.2% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current HAI score | -23.6% | -37.1% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current EVI score | -25.6% | -33.6% |

| MDGs progress | 1990-2000 |
|---|---|
| ■ MDG Hunger | Low progress |
| ■ MDG Primary education | Achieved |
| ■ MDG Gender equality in education | .. |
| ■ MDG Child mortality | Reversal/stagnation |
| ■ MDG Access to water | .. |

## WELL-BEING

| Health | 1990 | 2003 |
|---|---|---|
| Life expectancy at birth (years, male and female combined) | 50.3 | 54.0 |
| Fertility rate (births per woman) | 5.6 | 3.9 |
| ■ Under five mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) | 115 | 140 |
| | 1993-1998 | 1999-2004 |
| Physicians (per 1,000) | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| ■ Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total) | .. | 31.8% |

| Education | 2000-2004 | |
|---|---|---|
| Legal guarantee of primary free education | Free education guaranteed | |
| Adult literacy (% of people ages 15 and above) | 73.6% | |
| Youth literacy (% age 15-24) | 83.4% | |
| Ratio of literate females to literate males (ages 15 and above) | 75.6% | |
| Ratio of literate females to males (ages 15-24) | 89.7% | |
| | 1999/2000 | 2002/2003 |
| ■ School enrolment primary (% gross) | 102% | 124% |
| Pupil-teacher ratio primary | 50% | 56% |
| School enrolment secondary (% gross) | 17% | 25% |

| Public responsibility | 1999 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| Public expenditure on health (% of GDP) | 1.1% | 2.1% |
| General government expenditure on health (% of total government expenditure) | 11.3% | 18.6% |
| Out-of-pocket expenditure on health (% of total health expenditure) | 81.0% | 70.6% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of GDP) | 1.0% | 1.8% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of government expenditure) | 8.7% | 14.6%(a) |
| Military expenditure (% of GDP) | 3.6% | 2.5% |
| Military expenditure (% of government final consumption) | 71.7% | 38.7% |
| Prison data and justice | 1990-1995 | 1996-2005 |
| Prison population rates (per 100,000) | 24 | 47 |
| 2004 Pre-trial detainees (% of prison population) | 31.3% | |

## ECONOMY

| Economic overview | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| HDI | 0.533 | 0.571 |
| GDP per capita (constant international US$ at PPP) | 1450.7 | 2164.2 |
| Gross domestic savings (% of GDP) | -1.9% | 12.3% |
| Gross fixed capital formation (% of GDP) | 14.2% | 22.7% |
| Net foreign direct investment inflows (as % of GDP) | 4.5% | 2.1% |
| Inflation consumer prices (annual %) | 1.1% | 3.8% |

| Economic overview (continued) | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| General government final consumption expenditure (% of GDP) | 5.0% | 6.7% |
| Agricultural labour force (% of total labour force) | 74%(b) | 69% |
| Military personnel (% of total labour force) | 5.7% | 2.9% |
| **Debt and aid** | | |
| External debt per capita (DOD constant 2000 US$) | 221.0 | 221.3 |
| ■ Debt service total (% of exports) | 0.7% | 0.9% |
| Aid per capita (constant 2000 US$) | 53.8 | 35.8 |
| Aid (% of GNI) | 16.7% | 12.9% |
| 2005 HIPC initiative (decision point/completion point) | .. | |
| **International trade** | | |
| Trade (% of GDP) | 79.9% | 146.3% |
| Food exports (% of merchandise exports) | 53.6%(c) | 63.4% |
| Food imports (% of merchandise imports) | 13.5%(c) | 6.3% |
| Manufactures exports (% of merchandise exports) | 1.6%(c) | 0.7% |
| Manufactures imports (% of merchandise imports) | 76.5%(c) | 84.3% |
| Fuel exports (% of merchandise exports) | 0.1%(c) | 0.0% |
| Fuel imports (% of merchandise imports) | 7.6%(c) | 7.3% |
| **Information and communication technology** | | |
| ■ Fixed line and mobile phone subscribers (per 1,000) | 2.2 | 37.8 |
| Television sets (per 1,000) | 8.3 | 7.6(d) |
| 2004 Total number of permanent post offices (per 100,000) | 0.6 | |
| Daily newspapers (per 1,000) | .. | |
| **Poverty and inequality** | | |
| 1997 National Gini index | .. | |
| ■ 1997 Living on less than $1 a day (PPP) (% of population) | 34.1% | |
| ■ 1997 Living on less than $2 a day (PPP) (% of population) | 77.7% | |
| 1999 Poverty rate at national poverty line (% of population) | 35.9% | |
| 1999 Poverty rate at rural poverty line (% of rural population) | 40.1% | |
| 1999 Poverty rate at urban poverty line (% of urban population) | 13.9% | |
| 2003 HPI-1 rank – income poverty rank | 5 | |
| 2003 HDI rank – GDI rank | 0 | |

**GOVERNANCE**

| Parliamentary development | |
|---|---|
| Lower or single house | Radhsphea Ney Preah Recheanachakr Kampuchea |
| Upper house or senate | Senate |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Lower or single house | 7/27/03 |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Upper house or senate | 3/25/99 |
| Parliamentary term in lower or single house (years) | 5 |
| Parliamentarian obligation to declare personal assets | No |
| **Participation** | |
| 2003 Ratio of voters to registered voters (parliamentary) | 83.2% |
| Ratio of voters to registered voters (presidential) | .. |
| Year women received right to vote | 1955 |
| Year women received right to stand for election | 1955 |
| .. Parliamentary bodies dealing with human rights | Committee for Human Rights and Complaints |

| Aggregate indicators | | |
|---|---|---|
| World Bank governance indicators | 1996 | 2004 |
| Voice and accountability | -0.7 | -0.9 |
| Political stability | -1.1 | -0.6 |
| Government effectiveness | -0.6 | -0.9 |
| Regulatory quality | -0.3 | -0.2 |
| Rule of law | -0.9 | -1.0 |
| Control of corruption | -0.9 | -1.0 |

| ENVIRONMENT | 1990-1995 | 2000-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| ■ Proportion of land area covered by forest (%) | 56.1% | 52.9% |
| ■ Ratio of protected area to surface area | 17% | 22% |
| ■ Carbon dioxide emissions (metric tons per capita) | 0.0 | 0.0 |

Notes: (a) 2000/2001; (b) 1990; (c) 2000; (d) 2001.

# Cape Verde

■ = MDG

## COUNTRY OVERVIEW

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2004 | Population (In millions) | 0.5 | |
| 2004 | Population density (per sq km) | 119.4 | |
| 2004 | Urban population (% of total population) | 56.7% | |
| ■ 2001 | Slum population as percentage of urban population | 70% | |
| 2004 | Population female (% of total) | 51.4% | |
| 2004 | Age dependency ratio (dependents to working-age population) | | 0.79 |
| Indebtedness | | Less indebted | |
| Independence date | | 1975 | |

| Committee for Development Policy LDC criteria | Inclusion | Graduation |
|---|---|---|
| Gap to threshold in % of current GNI per capita (US$) | 43.3% | 32.0% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current HAI score | 23.6% | 15.3% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current EVI score | -33.3% | -40.5% |

| MDGs progress | 1990-2000 |
|---|---|
| ■ MDG Hunger | .. |
| ■ MDG Primary education | Achieved |
| ■ MDG Gender equality in education | .. |
| ■ MDG Child mortality | Achievable by 2015 |
| ■ MDG Access to water | .. |

## WELL-BEING

| Health | 1990 | 2003 |
|---|---|---|
| Life expectancy at birth (years, male and female combined) | 65.3 | 69.2 |
| Fertility rate (births per woman) | 5.5 | 3.5 |
| ■ Under five mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) | 60 | 35 |
| | 1993-1998 | 1999-2004 |
| Physicians (per 1,000) | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| ■ Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total) | 54.0% | 88.5%(a) |

| Education | 2000-2004 | |
|---|---|---|
| Legal guarantee of primary free education | No legal guarantee | |
| Adult literacy (% of people ages 15 and above) | 75.7% | |
| Youth literacy (% age 15-24) | 89.1% | |
| Ratio of literate females to literate males (ages 15 and above) | 79.7% | |
| Ratio of literate females to males (ages 15-24) | 93.8% | |
| | 1999/2000 | 2002/2003 |
| ■ School enrolment primary (% gross) | 125% | 121% |
| Pupil-teacher ratio primary | 29% | 28% |
| School enrolment secondary (% gross) | .. | 70% |

| Public responsibility | 1999 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| Public expenditure on health (% of GDP) | 3.3% | 3.8% |
| General government expenditure on health (% of total government expenditure) | 9.0% | 11.1% |
| Out-of-pocket expenditure on health (% of total health expenditure) | 26.0% | 24.9% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of GDP) | 4.4%(b) | 7.9% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of government expenditure) | .. | 17.0% |
| Military expenditure (% of GDP) | 0.8% | 0.7% |
| Military expenditure (% of government final consumption) | 4.3% | 4.8% |
| Prison data and justice | 1990-1995 | 1996-2005 |
| Prison population rates (per 100,000) | .. | 178 |
| 1999 Pre-trial detainees (% of prison population) | 36.5% | |

## ECONOMY

| Economic overview | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| HDI | 0.677 | 0.721 |
| GDP per capita (constant international US$ at PPP) | 4063.5 | 5289.2 |
| Gross domestic savings (% of GDP) | 2.4% | -12.6% |
| Gross fixed capital formation (% of GDP) | 42.4% | 21.6% |
| Net foreign direct investment inflows (as % of GDP) | 5.3% | 1.9% |
| Inflation consumer prices (annual %) | 8.4% | 1.9% |

| Economic overview (continued) | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| General government final consumption expenditure (% of GDP) | 19.8% | 14.8% |
| Agricultural labour force (% of total labour force) | 31%(c) | 22% |
| Military personnel (% of total labour force) | 0.8% | 0.7% |
| **Debt and aid** | | |
| External debt per capita (DOD constant 2000 US$) | 609.2 | 965.8 |
| ■ Debt service total (% of exports) | 5.0% | 5.7% |
| Aid per capita (constant 2000 US$) | 333.4 | 289.0 |
| Aid (% of GNI) | 24.2% | 18.3% |
| 2005 HIPC initiative (decision point/completion point) | .. | |
| **International trade** | | |
| Trade (% of GDP) | 78.3% | 100.2% |
| Food exports (% of merchandise exports) | 22.0% | 3.5%(d) |
| Food imports (% of merchandise imports) | 31.1% | 33.7%(d) |
| Manufactures exports (% of merchandise exports) | 76.7% | 95.7% |
| Manufactures imports (% of merchandise imports) | 51.6% | 57.7%(d) |
| Fuel exports (% of merchandise exports) | .. | .. |
| Fuel imports (% of merchandise imports) | 14.2% | 5.6%(d) |
| **Information and communication technology** | | |
| ■ Fixed line and mobile phone subscribers (per 1,000) | 55.7 | 272.6 |
| Television sets (per 1,000) | 2.6 | 105.0 |
| 2003 Total number of permanent post offices (per 100,000) | 11.3 | |
| Daily newspapers (per 1,000) | .. | |
| **Poverty and inequality** | | |
| National Gini index | 40.4 | |
| ■ Living on less than $1 a day (PPP) (% of population) | .. | |
| ■ Living on less than $2 a day (PPP) (% of population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at national poverty line (% of population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at rural poverty line (% of rural population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at urban poverty line (% of urban population) | .. | |
| HPI-1 rank – income poverty rank | .. | |
| 2003 HDI rank – GDI rank | 0 | |
| **GOVERNANCE** | | |
| **Parliamentary development** | | |
| Lower or single house | Assembleia Nacional | |
| Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Lower or single house | 1/14/01 | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Parliamentary term in lower or single house (years) | 5 | |
| Parliamentarian obligation to declare personal assets | Yes | |
| **Participation** | | |
| 2001 Ratio of voters to registered voters (parliamentary) | 54.1% | |
| 2001 Ratio of voters to registered voters (presidential) | 58.9% | |
| Year women received right to vote | 1975 | |
| Year women received right to stand for election | 1975 | |
| Parliamentary bodies dealing with human rights | .. | |
| **Aggregate indicators** | | |
| World Bank governance indicators | 1996 | 2004 |
| Voice and accountability | 0.9 | 0.8 |
| Political stability | 0.8(e) | 0.7 |
| Government effectiveness | -0.1 | -0.2 |
| Regulatory quality | -0.6 | 0.3 |
| Rule of law | 0.1 | 0.3 |
| Control of corruption | -0.3(e) | 0.3 |
| **ENVIRONMENT** | **1990-1995** | **2000-2004** |
| ■ Proportion of land area covered by forest (%) | 8.7% | 21.1% |
| ■ Ratio of protected area to surface area | .. | .. |
| ■ Carbon dioxide emissions (metric tons per capita) | 0.3 | 0.3 |

Notes: (a) 1998; (b) 1998/1999; (c) 1990; (d) 2001; (e) 2002.

# Central African Republic

■ = MDG

## COUNTRY OVERVIEW

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2004 | Population (In millions) | 3.9 | |
| 2004 | Population density (per sq km) | 6.3 | |
| 2004 | Urban population (% of total population) | 43.3% | |
| ■ 2001 | Slum population as percentage of urban population | 92% | |
| 2004 | Population female (% of total) | 51.3% | |
| 2004 | Age dependency ratio (dependents to working-age population) | | 0.82 |
| Indebtedness | | Severely indebted | |
| Independence date | | 1960 | |

| Committee for Development Policy LDC criteria | Inclusion | Graduation |
|---|---|---|
| Gap to threshold in % of current GNI per capita (US$) | -170.8% | -224.9% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current HAI score | -83.9% | -104.0% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current EVI score | -14.2% | -23.4% |

| MDGs progress | 1990-2000 |
|---|---|
| ■ MDG Hunger | Low progress |
| ■ MDG Primary education | Low progress |
| ■ MDG Gender equality in education | .. |
| ■ MDG Child mortality | Reversal/stagnation |
| ■ MDG Access to water | Achievable by 2015 |

## WELL-BEING

| Health | 1990 | 2003 |
|---|---|---|
| Life expectancy at birth (years, male and female combined) | 47.6 | 41.8 |
| Fertility rate (births per woman) | 5.5 | 4.6 |
| ■ Under five mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) | 180 | 180 |
| | 1993-1998 | 1999-2004 |
| Physicians (per 1,000) | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| ■ Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total) | 45.9% | 44.0% |

| Education | 2000-2004 | |
|---|---|---|
| Legal guarantee of primary free education | No legal guarantee | |
| Adult literacy (% of people ages 15 and above) | 48.6% | |
| Youth literacy (% age 15-24) | 58.5% | |
| Ratio of literate females to literate males (ages 15 and above) | 51.7% | |
| Ratio of literate females to males (ages 15-24) | 66.6% | |
| | 1999/2000 | 2002/2003 |
| ■ School enrolment primary (% gross) | 75%(a) | 66% |
| Pupil-teacher ratio primary | .. | .. |
| School enrolment secondary (% gross) | 12%(a) | 12%(b) |

| Public responsibility | 1999 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| Public expenditure on health (% of GDP) | 1.3% | 1.6% |
| General government expenditure on health (% of total government expenditure) | 7.7% | 7.4% |
| Out-of-pocket expenditure on health (% of total health expenditure) | 59.0% | 55.7% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of GDP) | 1.9%(c) | .. |
| Public expenditure on education (% of government expenditure) | .. | .. |
| Military expenditure (% of GDP) | 1.2%(d) | 1.3% |
| Military expenditure (% of government final consumption) | .. | .. |
| Prison data and justice | 1990-1995 | 1996-2005 |
| Prison population rates (per 100,000) | .. | 110 |
| Pre-trial detainees (% of prison population) | .. | |

## ECONOMY

| Economic overview | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| HDI | 0.367 | 0.355 |
| GDP per capita (constant international US$ at PPP) | 1147.8 | 1041.6 |
| Gross domestic savings (% of GDP) | 6.2% | 11.9% |
| Gross fixed capital formation (% of GDP) | 13.1% | 6.9% |
| Net foreign direct investment inflows (as % of GDP) | 0.6% | 0.3% |
| Inflation consumer prices (annual %) | 19.2% | -1.7% |

| Economic overview (continued) | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| General government final consumption expenditure (% of GDP) | 15.2% | 10.1% |
| Agricultural labour force (% of total labour force) | 80%(e) | 71% |
| Military personnel (% of total labour force) | 0.3% | 0.2% |
| **Debt and aid** | | |
| External debt per capita (DOD constant 2000 US$) | 306.3 | 323.2 |
| ■ Debt service total (% of exports) | 12.9%(f) | .. |
| Aid per capita (constant 2000 US$) | 54.6 | 12.1 |
| Aid (% of GNI) | 15.3% | 4.2% |
| 2005 HIPC initiative (decision point/completion point) | Country still to be considered | |
| **International trade** | | |
| Trade (% of GDP) | 48.1% | 55.0% |
| Food exports (% of merchandise exports) | 4.2% | 1.4% |
| Food imports (% of merchandise imports) | 15.6% | 23.4% |
| Manufactures exports (% of merchandise exports) | 44.8% | 36.6% |
| Manufactures imports (% of merchandise imports) | 64.2% | 55.9% |
| Fuel exports (% of merchandise exports) | 0.8% | 0.0% |
| Fuel imports (% of merchandise imports) | 8.7% | 11.0% |
| **Information and communication technology** | | |
| ■ Fixed line and mobile phone subscribers (per 1,000) | 2.5 | 5.5 |
| Television sets (per 1,000) | 4.8 | 5.0 |
| 2004 Total number of permanent post offices (per 100,000) | 0.6 | |
| 1998 Daily newspapers (per 1,000) | 1.7 | |
| **Poverty and inequality** | | |
| 1993 National Gini index | 61.3 | |
| ■ 1993 Living on less than $1 a day (PPP) (% of population) | 66.6% | |
| ■ 1993 Living on less than $2 a day (PPP) (% of population) | 84.0% | |
| Poverty rate at national poverty line (% of population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at rural poverty line (% of rural population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at urban poverty line (% of urban population) | .. | |
| 2003 HPI-1 rank – income poverty rank | -5 | |
| HDI rank – GDI rank | .. | |
| **GOVERNANCE** | | |
| **Parliamentary development** | | |
| Lower or single house | Assemblée Nationale | |
| Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Lower or single house | 3/13/05 | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Parliamentary term in lower or single house (years) | 5 | |
| Parliamentarian obligation to declare personal assets | No | |
| **Participation** | | |
| 1998 Ratio of voters to registered voters (parliamentary) | 58.5% | |
| 1999 Ratio of voters to registered voters (presidential) | 59.1% | |
| Year women received right to vote | 1986 | |
| Year women received right to stand for election | 1986 | |
| 2001 Parliamentary bodies dealing with human rights | Committee on Petitions, Human Rights and | |
| International Humanitarian Law | | |
| **Aggregate indicators** | | |
| World Bank governance indicators | 1996 | 2004 |
| Voice and accountability | -0.2 | -1.2 |
| Political stability | 0.0 | -1.4 |
| Government effectiveness | -0.8 | -1.7 |
| Regulatory quality | -0.3 | -1.3 |
| Rule of law | -0.2 | -1.4 |
| Control of corruption | -0.5(g) | -1.4 |
| **ENVIRONMENT** | **1990-1995** | **2000-2004** |
| ■ Proportion of land area covered by forest (%) | 37.3% | 36.8% |
| ■ Ratio of protected area to surface area | 17% | 17% |
| ■ Carbon dioxide emissions (metric tons per capita) | 0.1 | 0.1 |

Notes: (a) 2000/2001; (b) 2001/2002; (c) 1998/1999; (d) 1996; (e) 1990; (f) 1994; (g) 1998.

# Chad

■ = MDG

## COUNTRY OVERVIEW

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2004 | Population (In millions) | 8.8 | |
| 2004 | Population density (per sq km) | 7.0 | |
| 2004 | Urban population (% of total population) | 25.4% | |
| ■ 2001 | Slum population as percentage of urban population | 99% | |
| 2004 | Population female (% of total) | 50.6% | |
| 2004 | Age dependency ratio (dependents to working-age population) | | 1.00 |
| Indebtedness | | Severely indebted | |
| Independence date | | 1960 | |

| Committee for Development Policy LDC criteria | Inclusion | Graduation |
|---|---|---|
| Gap to threshold in % of current GNI per capita (US$) | -269.5% | -343.3% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current HAI score | -110.7% | -133.7% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current EVI score | -37.5% | -44.3% |

| MDGs progress | 1990-2000 |
|---|---|
| ■ MDG Hunger | Achievable by 2015 |
| ■ MDG Primary education | .. |
| ■ MDG Gender equality in education | .. |
| ■ MDG Child mortality | Reversal/stagnation |
| ■ MDG Access to water | .. |

## WELL-BEING

| Health | 1990 | 2003 |
|---|---|---|
| Life expectancy at birth (years, male and female combined) | 46.2 | 48.3 |
| Fertility rate (births per woman) | 7.1 | 6.2 |
| ■ Under five mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) | 203 | 200 |
| | 1993-1998 | 1999-2004 |
| Physicians (per 1,000) | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| ■ Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total) | 15.0% | 16.3% |

| Education | 2000-2004 | |
|---|---|---|
| Legal guarantee of primary free education | Free education guaranteed | |
| Adult literacy (% of people ages 15 and above) | 25.5% | |
| Youth literacy (% age 15-24) | 37.3% | |
| Ratio of literate females to literate males (ages 15 and above) | 31.4% | |
| Ratio of literate females to males (ages 15-24) | 41.7% | |
| | 1999/2000 | 2002/2003 |
| ■ School enrolment primary (% gross) | 70% | 76% |
| Pupil-teacher ratio primary | 69% | 68% |
| School enrolment secondary (% gross) | 12% | 16% |

| Public responsibility | 1999 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| Public expenditure on health (% of GDP) | 2.1% | 2.7% |
| General government expenditure on health (% of total government expenditure) | 10.5% | 12.2% |
| Out-of-pocket expenditure on health (% of total health expenditure) | 64.6% | 56.1% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of GDP) | 2.0% | .. |
| Public expenditure on education (% of government expenditure) | .. | .. |
| Military expenditure (% of GDP) | 1.4% | 1.5% |
| Military expenditure (% of government final consumption) | 19.5% | 23.6% |
| Prison data and justice | 1990-1995 | 1996-2005 |
| Prison population rates (per 100,000) | .. | 46 |
| 2002 Pre-trial detainees (% of prison population) | 22.6% | |

## ECONOMY

| Economic overview | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| HDI | 0.344 | 0.341 |
| GDP per capita (constant international US$ at PPP) | 889.5 | 2120.3 |
| Gross domestic savings (% of GDP) | -1.7% | 43.2% |
| Gross fixed capital formation (% of GDP) | 11.6% | 24.7% |
| Net foreign direct investment inflows (as % of GDP) | 2.3% | 32.1% |
| Inflation consumer prices (annual %) | 9.1% | -1.9% |

| Economic overview (continued) | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| General government final consumption expenditure (% of GDP) | 11.8% | 5.0% |
| Agricultural labour force (% of total labour force) | 83%(a) | 73% |
| Military personnel (% of total labour force) | 1.1% | 0.9% |
| **Debt and aid** | | |
| External debt per capita (DOD constant 2000 US$) | 146.0 | 165.0 |
| ■ Debt service total (% of exports) | 9.2%(b) | .. |
| Aid per capita (constant 2000 US$) | 38.1 | 27.2 |
| Aid (% of GNI) | 16.8% | 10.6% |
| 2005 HIPC initiative (decision point/completion point) | Country has reached decision point | |
| **International trade** | | |
| Trade (% of GDP) | 56.5% | 90.3% |
| Food exports (% of merchandise exports) | .. | .. |
| Food imports (% of merchandise imports) | 24.0% | .. |
| Manufactures exports (% of merchandise exports) | .. | .. |
| Manufactures imports (% of merchandise imports) | 55.8% | .. |
| Fuel exports (% of merchandise exports) | .. | .. |
| Fuel imports (% of merchandise imports) | 17.9% | .. |
| **Information and communication technology** | | |
| ■ Fixed line and mobile phone subscribers (per 1,000) | 0.8 | 5.8 |
| Television sets (per 1,000) | 3.4 | 5.1 |
| 2004 Total number of permanent post offices (per 100,000) | 0.5 | |
| 1998 Daily newspapers (per 1,000) | 0.2 | |
| **Poverty and inequality** | | |
| National Gini index | .. | |
| ■ Living on less than $1 a day (PPP) (% of population) | .. | |
| ■ Living on less than $2 a day (PPP) (% of population) | .. | |
| 1996 Poverty rate at national poverty line (% of population) | 64.0% | |
| 1996 Poverty rate at rural poverty line (% of rural population) | 67.0% | |
| 1996 Poverty rate at urban poverty line (% of urban population) | 63.0% | |
| HPI-1 rank – income poverty rank | .. | |
| 2003 HDI rank – GDI rank | -1 | |
| **GOVERNANCE** | | |
| **Parliamentary development** | | |
| Lower or single house | Assemblée Nationale | |
| Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Lower or single house | 4/21/02 | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Parliamentary term in lower or single house (years) | 4 | |
| Parliamentarian obligation to declare personal assets | No | |
| **Participation** | | |
| 1997 Ratio of voters to registered voters (parliamentary) | 50.1% | |
| 2001 Ratio of voters to registered voters (presidential) | 61.1% | |
| Year women received right to vote | 1958 | |
| Year women received right to stand for election | 1958 | |
| 2002 Parliamentary bodies dealing with human rights | Committee on Communication, Fundamental | |
| Rights and Liberties | | |
| **Aggregate indicators** | | |
| World Bank governance indicators | 1996 | 2004 |
| Voice and accountability | -0.8 | -1.1 |
| Political stability | -0.7 | -1.2 |
| Government effectiveness | -0.6 | -1.3 |
| Regulatory quality | 0.0 | -0.8 |
| Rule of law | -0.2 | -1.2 |
| Control of corruption | -0.8(c) | -1.1 |
| **ENVIRONMENT** | **1990-1995** | **2000-2004** |
| ■ Proportion of land area covered by forest (%) | 10.7% | 10.1% |
| ■ Ratio of protected area to surface area | 9% | 9% |
| ■ Carbon dioxide emissions (metric tons per capita) | 0.0 | 0.0 |

Notes:(a) 1990; (b) 1994; (c) 1998.

# Comoros

■ = MDG

## COUNTRY OVERVIEW

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2004 | Population (In millions) | 0.6 | |
| 2004 | Population density (per sq km) | 275.6 | |
| 2004 | Urban population (% of total population) | 35.7% | |
| ■ 2001 | Slum population as percentage of urban population | 61% | |
| 2004 | Population female (% of total) | 50.1% | |
| 2004 | Age dependency ratio (dependents to working-age population) | | 0.79 |
| Indebtedness | | Severely indebted | |
| Independence date | | 1975 | |

| Committee for Development Policy LDC criteria | Inclusion | Graduation |
|---|---|---|
| Gap to threshold in % of current GNI per capita (US$) | -93.8% | -132.6% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current HAI score | -44.4% | -60.1% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current EVI score | -37.4% | -44.2% |
| MDGs progress | 1990-2000 | |
| ■ MDG Hunger | .. | |
| ■ MDG Primary education | .. | |
| ■ MDG Gender equality in education | .. | |
| ■ MDG Child mortality | Achievable by 2015 | |
| ■ MDG Access to water | Achieved | |

## WELL-BEING

| Health | 1990 | 2003 |
|---|---|---|
| Life expectancy at birth (years, male and female combined) | 56.0 | 61.6 |
| Fertility rate (births per woman) | 5.8 | 4.0 |
| ■ Under five mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) | 120 | 73 |
| | 1993-1998 | 1999-2004 |
| Physicians (per 1,000) | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| ■ Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total) | 51.6% | 61.8% |

| Education | 2000-2004 | |
|---|---|---|
| Legal guarantee of primary free education | No legal guarantee | |
| Adult literacy (% of people ages 15 and above) | 56.2% | |
| Youth literacy (% age 15-24) | 59.0% | |
| Ratio of literate females to literate males (ages 15 and above) | 77.4% | |
| Ratio of literate females to males (ages 15-24) | 79.5% | |
| | 1999/2000 | 2002/2003 |
| ■ School enrolment primary (% gross) | 84% | 90% |
| Pupil-teacher ratio primary | 37% | 37% |
| School enrolment secondary (% gross) | 24% | 31% |

| Public responsibility | 1999 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| Public expenditure on health (% of GDP) | 1.9% | 1.7% |
| General government expenditure on health (% of total government expenditure) | 11.2% | 8.2% |
| Out-of-pocket expenditure on health (% of total health expenditure) | 39.2% | 42.0% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of GDP) | 3.8% | 3.9% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of government expenditure) | 23.5%(a) | 24.1% |
| Military expenditure (% of GDP) | .. | .. |
| Military expenditure (% of government final consumption) | .. | .. |
| Prison data and justice | 1990-1995 | 1996-2005 |
| Prison population rates (per 100,000) | .. | 30 |
| 2000-2004 Pre-trial detainees (% of prison population) | 50.0% | |

## ECONOMY

| Economic overview | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| HDI | 0.517 | 0.547 |
| GDP per capita (constant international US$ at PPP) | 1792.7 | 1715.0 |
| Gross domestic savings (% of GDP) | -5.3% | 0.6% |
| Gross fixed capital formation (% of GDP) | 15.5% | 8.7% |
| Net foreign direct investment inflows (as % of GDP) | 0.4% | 0.3% |
| Inflation consumer prices (annual %) | .. | .. |

| Economic overview (continued) | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| General government final consumption expenditure (% of GDP) | 22.3% | 18.1% |
| Agricultural labour force (% of total labour force) | 78%(b) | 73% |
| Military personnel (% of total labour force) | .. | .. |
| **Debt and aid** | | |
| External debt per capita (DOD constant 2000 US$) | 471.2 | 452.7 |
| ■ Debt service total (% of exports) | 1.6% | .. |
| Aid per capita (constant 2000 US$) | 92.2 | 38.6 |
| Aid (% of GNI) | 17.9% | 7.7% |
| 2005 HIPC initiative (decision point/completion point) | Country still to be considered | |
| **International trade** | | |
| Trade (% of GDP) | 64.3% | 37.0% |
| Food exports (% of merchandise exports) | 76.4% | 88.7% |
| Food imports (% of merchandise imports) | 48.5% | 21.9%(c) |
| Manufactures exports (% of merchandise exports) | 23.2% | 8.2% |
| Manufactures imports (% of merchandise imports) | 36.7% | 51.0% |
| Fuel exports (% of merchandise exports) | .. | 0.1%(d) |
| Fuel imports (% of merchandise imports) | 12.6% | 4.1%(c) |
| **Information and communication technology** | | |
| ■ Fixed line and mobile phone subscribers (per 1,000) | 7.2 | 19.1 |
| Television sets (per 1,000) | 18.9 | 24.3 |
| 2001 Total number of permanent post offices (per 100,000) | 5.1 | |
| Daily newspapers (per 1,000) | .. | |
| **Poverty and inequality** | | |
| National Gini index | .. | |
| ■ Living on less than $1 a day (PPP) (% of population) | .. | |
| ■ Living on less than $2 a day (PPP) (% of population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at national poverty line (% of population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at rural poverty line (% of rural population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at urban poverty line (% of urban population) | .. | |
| HPI-1 rank – income poverty rank | .. | |
| 2003 HDI rank – GDI rank | 0 | |
| **GOVERNANCE** | | |
| **Parliamentary development** | | |
| Lower or single house | Assemblée de l'Union | |
| Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Lower or single house | 4/18/04 | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Parliamentary term in lower or single house (years) | 5 | |
| Parliamentarian obligation to declare personal assets | No | |
| **Participation** | | |
| 1987 Ratio of voters to registered voters (parliamentary) | 65.0% | |
| 1996 Ratio of voters to registered voters (presidential) | 62.0% | |
| Year women received right to vote | 1956 | |
| Year women received right to stand for election | 1956 | |
| Parliamentary bodies dealing with human rights | .. | |
| **Aggregate indicators** | | |
| World Bank governance indicators | 1996 | 2004 |
| Voice and accountability | -0.1 | -0.1 |
| Political stability | -0.2(e) | -0.1 |
| Government effectiveness | -0.6 | -1.4 |
| Regulatory quality | -0.7 | -1.1 |
| Rule of law | -1.0(f) | -1.0 |
| Control of corruption | -0.8(f) | -1.1 |
| **ENVIRONMENT** | **1990-1995** | **2000-2004** |
| ■ Proportion of land area covered by forest (%) | 6.5% | 4.3% |
| ■ Ratio of protected area to surface area | 0% | 3% |
| ■ Carbon dioxide emissions (metric tons per capita) | 0.1 | 0.1 |

Notes:(a) 1998/1999; (b) 1990; (c) 2000; (d) 1997; (e) 2002; (f) 1998.

# Democratic Republic of the Congo

■ = MDG

## COUNTRY OVERVIEW

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2004 | Population (In millions) | 54.8 | |
| 2004 | Population density (per sq km) | 24.2 | |
| 2004 | Urban population (% of total population) | 32.3% | |
| ■ 2001 | Slum population as percentage of urban population | 50% | |
| 2004 | Population female (% of total) | 50.4% | |
| 2004 | Age dependency ratio (dependents to working-age population) | | 1.02 |
| Indebtedness | | Severely indebted | |
| Independence date | | 1960 | |

| Committee for Development Policy LDC criteria | Inclusion | Graduation |
|---|---|---|
| Gap to threshold in % of current GNI per capita (US$) | -650.0% | -800.0% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current HAI score | -60.3% | -77.8% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current EVI score | -9.3% | -19.1% |

| MDGs progress | 1990-2000 |
|---|---|
| ■ MDG Hunger | Reversal/stagnation |
| ■ MDG Primary education | Reversal/stagnation |
| ■ MDG Gender equality in education | Achievable by 2015 |
| ■ MDG Child mortality | Reversal/stagnation |
| ■ MDG Access to water | .. |

## WELL-BEING

| Health | 1990 | 2003 |
|---|---|---|
| Life expectancy at birth (years, male and female combined) | 51.5 | 45.2 |
| Fertility rate (births per woman) | 6.7 | 6.7 |
| ■ Under five mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) | 205 | 205 |
| | 1993-1998 | 1999-2004 |
| Physicians (per 1,000) | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| ■ Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total) | .. | 60.7% |

| Education | 2000-2004 | |
|---|---|---|
| Legal guarantee of primary free education | Free education guaranteed | |
| Adult literacy (% of people ages 15 and above) | 65.3% | |
| Youth literacy (% age 15-24) | 68.7% | |
| Ratio of literate females to literate males (ages 15 and above) | 65.0% | |
| Ratio of literate females to males (ages 15-24) | 79.6% | |
| | 1999/2000 | 2002/2003 |
| ■ School enrolment primary (% gross) | 50% | .. |
| Pupil-teacher ratio primary | 26%(a) | .. |
| School enrolment secondary (% gross) | 18% | .. |

| Public responsibility | 1999 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| Public expenditure on health (% of GDP) | 0.2% | 1.1% |
| General government expenditure on health (% of total government expenditure) | 2.6% | 16.4% |
| Out-of-pocket expenditure on health (% of total health expenditure) | 92.8% | 69.8% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of GDP) | .. | .. |
| Public expenditure on education (% of government expenditure) | .. | .. |
| Military expenditure (% of GDP) | 1.2% | .. |
| Military expenditure (% of government final consumption) | 44.5% | 41.2%(b) |
| Prison data and justice | 1990-1995 | 1996-2005 |
| Prison population rates (per 100,000) | .. | 57 |
| Pre-trial detainees (% of prison population) | .. | |

## ECONOMY

| Economic overview | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| HDI | 0.393 | 0.385 |
| GDP per capita (constant international US$ at PPP) | 963.9 | 650.4 |
| Gross domestic savings (% of GDP) | 14.1% | 4.1%(c) |
| Gross fixed capital formation (% of GDP) | 9.7% | 13.7% |
| Net foreign direct investment inflows (as % of GDP) | -0.4% | 2.8% |
| Inflation consumer prices (annual %) | 541.9% | 31.5% |

| Economic overview (continued) | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| General government final consumption expenditure (% of GDP) | 4.9% | 3.8% |
| Agricultural labour force (% of total labour force) | 68%(d) | 62% |
| Military personnel (% of total labour force) | 0.3% | 0.5% |
| **Debt and aid** | | |
| External debt per capita (DOD constant 2000 US$) | 323.9 | 198.5 |
| ■ Debt service total (% of exports) | .. | .. |
| Aid per capita (constant 2000 US$) | 4.8 | 95.6 |
| Aid (% of GNI) | 4.0% | 97.9% |
| 2005 HIPC initiative (decision point/completion point) | Country has reached decision point | |
| **International trade** | | |
| Trade (% of GDP) | 52.2% | 40.9% |
| Food exports (% of merchandise exports) | .. | .. |
| Food imports (% of merchandise imports) | .. | .. |
| Manufactures exports (% of merchandise exports) | .. | 9.6% |
| Manufactures imports (% of merchandise imports) | .. | 62.7% |
| Fuel exports (% of merchandise exports) | .. | .. |
| Fuel imports (% of merchandise imports) | .. | .. |
| **Information and communication technology** | | |
| ■ Fixed line and mobile phone subscribers (per 1,000) | 1.0 | 10.8 |
| Television sets (per 1,000) | 1.9 | 2.3 |
| 2003 Total number of permanent post offices (per 100,000) | 0.5 | |
| 1998 Daily newspapers (per 1,000) | 2.8 | |
| **Poverty and inequality** | | |
| National Gini index | .. | |
| ■ Living on less than $1 a day (PPP) (% of population) | .. | |
| ■ Living on less than $2 a day (PPP) (% of population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at national poverty line (% of population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at rural poverty line (% of rural population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at urban poverty line (% of urban population) | .. | |
| HPI-1 rank – income poverty rank | .. | |
| 2003 HDI rank – GDI rank | 0 | |
| **GOVERNANCE** | | |
| **Parliamentary development** | | |
| Lower or single house | Assemblée Nationale | |
| Upper house or senate | Sénat | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Lower or single house | 8/22/03 | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Upper house or senate | 8/22/03 | |
| Parliamentary term in lower or single house (years) | Transitional period | |
| Parliamentarian obligation to declare personal assets | No | |
| **Participation** | | |
| 1992 Ratio of voters to registered voters (parliamentary) | 70.9% | |
| Ratio of voters to registered voters (presidential) | .. | |
| Year women received right to vote | 1967 | |
| Year women received right to stand for election | 1970 | |
| Parliamentary bodies dealing with human rights | .. | |
| **Aggregate indicators** | | |
| World Bank governance indicators | 1996 | 2004 |
| Voice and accountability | -1.2 | -1.6 |
| Political stability | -1.7 | -2.3 |
| Government effectiveness | -2.1 | -1.4 |
| Regulatory quality | -2.4 | -1.8 |
| Rule of law | -1.8 | -1.7 |
| Control of corruption | -2.0 | -1.3 |
| **ENVIRONMENT** | **1990-1995** | **2000-2004** |
| ■ Proportion of land area covered by forest (%) | 62.0% | 59.6% |
| ■ Ratio of protected area to surface area | 8% | 8% |
| ■ Carbon dioxide emissions (metric tons per capita) | 0.1 | 0.0 |

Notes: (a) 1998/1999; (b) 2000; (c) 2002; (d) 1990.

# Djibouti

■ = MDG

## COUNTRY OVERVIEW

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2004 | Population (In millions) | 0.7 | |
| 2004 | Population density (per sq km) | 30.9 | |
| 2004 | Urban population (% of total population) | 84.1% | |
| ■ 2001 | Slum population as percentage of urban population | .. | |
| 2004 | Population female (% of total) | 50.0% | |
| 2004 | Age dependency ratio (dependents to working-age population) | | 0.84 |
| Indebtedness | | Less indebted | |
| Independence date | | 1977 | |

| Committee for Development Policy LDC criteria | Inclusion | Graduation |
|---|---|---|
| Gap to threshold in % of current GNI per capita (US$) | 14.1% | -3.1% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current HAI score | -82.1% | -102.0% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current EVI score | -23.9% | -32.1% |

| MDGs progress | 1990-2000 |
|---|---|
| ■ MDG Hunger | .. |
| ■ MDG Primary education | Reversal/stagnation |
| ■ MDG Gender equality in education | Achievable in 2015 |
| ■ MDG Child mortality | Low progress |
| ■ MDG Access to water | Achieved |

## WELL-BEING

| Health | 1990 | 2003 |
|---|---|---|
| Life expectancy at birth (years, male and female combined) | 47.8 | 43.0 |
| Fertility rate (births per woman) | 6.0 | 5.2 |
| ■ Under five mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) | 175 | 138 |
| | 1993-1998 | 1999-2004 |
| Physicians (per 1,000) | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| ■ Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total) | .. | 61.0% |

| Education | 2000-2004 | |
|---|---|---|
| Legal guarantee of primary free education | No legal guarantee | |
| Adult literacy (% of people ages 15 and above) | .. | |
| Youth literacy (% age 15-24) | .. | |
| Ratio of literate females to literate males (ages 15 and above) | .. | |
| Ratio of literate females to males (ages 15-24) | .. | |
| | 1999/2000 | 2002/2003 |
| ■ School enrolment primary (% gross) | 37% | 40% |
| Pupil-teacher ratio primary | 32% | 34%(a) |
| School enrolment secondary (% gross) | 16% | 20% |

| Public responsibility | 1999 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| Public expenditure on health (% of GDP) | 3.3% | 3.3% |
| General government expenditure on health (% of total government expenditure) | 10.0% | 10.1% |
| Out-of-pocket expenditure on health (% of total health expenditure) | 25.2% | 24.9% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of GDP) | 3.5%(b) | .. |
| Public expenditure on education (% of government expenditure) | .. | .. |
| Military expenditure (% of GDP) | 4.3% | 4.3% |
| Military expenditure (% of government final consumption) | .. | .. |
| Prison data and justice | 1990-1995 | 1996-2005 |
| Prison population rates (per 100,000) | .. | 61 |
| 1999 Pre-trial detainees (% of prison population) | 57.2% | |

## ECONOMY

| Economic overview | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| HDI | 0.477 | 0.495 |
| GDP per capita (constant international US$ at PPP) | 2273.3 | 1947.8 |
| Gross domestic savings (% of GDP) | -8.3% | -5.3%(c) |
| Gross fixed capital formation (% of GDP) | 8.4% | 12.8%(c) |
| Net foreign direct investment inflows (as % of GDP) | 0.6% | 1.8% |
| Inflation consumer prices (annual %) | .. | .. |

| Economic overview (continued) | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| General government final consumption expenditure (% of GDP) | 32.4% | 25.2%(c) |
| Agricultural labour force (% of total labour force) | 82%(d) | 78% |
| Military personnel (% of total labour force) | .. | .. |
| **Debt and aid** | | |
| External debt per capita (DOD constant 2000 US$) | 527.6 | 530.4 |
| ■ Debt service total (% of exports) | 5.5% | .. |
| Aid per capita (constant 2000 US$) | 196.8 | 104.2 |
| Aid (% of GNI) | 20.4% | 11.7% |
| 2005 HIPC initiative (decision point/completion point) | .. | |
| **International trade** | | |
| Trade (% of GDP) | 98.4% | 107.4%(c) |
| Food exports (% of merchandise exports) | 21.2%(e) | .. |
| Food imports (% of merchandise imports) | 27.0%(e) | .. |
| Manufactures exports (% of merchandise exports) | 13.4%(e) | .. |
| Manufactures imports (% of merchandise imports) | 49.7%(e) | .. |
| Fuel exports (% of merchandise exports) | 0.2%(e) | .. |
| Fuel imports (% of merchandise imports) | 8.1%(e) | .. |
| **Information and communication technology** | | |
| ■ Fixed line and mobile phone subscribers (per 1,000) | 13.1 | 49.7 |
| Television sets (per 1,000) | 72.6 | 77.7 |
| 2004 Total number of permanent post offices (per 100,000) | 1.5 | |
| Daily newspapers (per 1,000) | .. | |
| **Poverty and inequality** | | |
| National Gini index | .. | |
| ■ Living on less than $1 a day (PPP) (% of population) | .. | |
| ■ Living on less than $2 a day (PPP) (% of population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at national poverty line (% of population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at rural poverty line (% of rural population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at urban poverty line (% of urban population) | .. | |
| HPI-1 rank – income poverty rank | .. | |
| HDI rank – GDI rank | .. | |
| **GOVERNANCE** | | |
| **Parliamentary development** | | |
| Lower or single house | Assemblée Nationale | |
| Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Lower or single house | 1/10/03 | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Parliamentary term in lower or single house (years) | 5 | |
| Parliamentarian obligation to declare personal assets | No | |
| **Participation** | | |
| 1997 Ratio of voters to registered voters (parliamentary) | 56.8% | |
| 1999 Ratio of voters to registered voters (presidential) | 56.3% | |
| Year women received right to vote | 1946 | |
| Year women received right to stand for election | 1986 | |
| Parliamentary bodies dealing with human rights | .. | |
| **Aggregate indicators** | | |
| World Bank governance indicators | 1996 | 2004 |
| Voice and accountability | -0.8 | -0.8 |
| Political stability | -0.7(f) | -0.4 |
| Government effectiveness | -1.1 | -0.8 |
| Regulatory quality | 0.0 | -0.8 |
| Rule of law | -0.3(g) | -0.6 |
| Control of corruption | -0.8(g) | -0.9 |
| **ENVIRONMENT** | **1990-1995** | **2000-2004** |
| ■ Proportion of land area covered by forest (%) | 0.3% | 0.3% |
| ■ Ratio of protected area to surface area | 0% | 0% |
| ■ Carbon dioxide emissions (metric tons per capita) | 0.6 | 0.5 |

Notes: (a) 2001/2002; (b) 1998/1999; (c) 2000; (d) 1990; (e) 1992; (f) 2002; (g) 1998.

# Equatorial Guinea

■ = MDG

## COUNTRY OVERVIEW

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2004 | Population (In millions) | 0.5 | |
| 2004 | Population density (per sq km) | 18.0 | |
| 2004 | Urban population (% of total population) | 49.0% | |
| ■ 2001 | Slum population as percentage of urban population | 87% | |
| 2004 | Population female (% of total) | 50.6% | |
| 2004 | Age dependency ratio (dependents to working-age population) | | 0.89 |
| Indebtedness | | Less indebted | |
| Independence date | | 1968 | |

| Committee for Development Policy LDC criteria | Inclusion | Graduation |
|---|---|---|
| Gap to threshold in % of current GNI per capita (US$) | -0.9% | -21.1% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current HAI score | -16.5% | -29.2% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current EVI score | -42.5% | -48.8% |

| MDGs progress | 1990-2000 |
|---|---|
| ■ MDG Hunger | .. |
| ■ MDG Primary education | .. |
| ■ MDG Gender equality in education | .. |
| ■ MDG Child mortality | Low progress |
| ■ MDG Access to water | .. |

## WELL-BEING

| Health | 1990 | 2003 |
|---|---|---|
| Life expectancy at birth (years, male and female combined) | 47.2 | 52.2 |
| Fertility rate (births per woman) | 5.9 | 5.4 |
| ■ Under five mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) | 206 | 146 |
| | 1993-1998 | 1999-2004 |
| Physicians (per 1,000) | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| ■ Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total) | 5.0% | 64.6% |

| Education | 2000-2004 | |
|---|---|---|
| Legal guarantee of primary free education | Free education guaranteed | |
| Adult literacy (% of people ages 15 and above) | 84.2% | |
| Youth literacy (% age 15-24) | 93.8% | |
| Ratio of literate females to literate males (ages 15 and above) | 82.9% | |
| Ratio of literate females to males (ages 15-24) | 99.8% | |
| | 1999/2000 | 2002/2003 |
| ■ School enrolment primary (% gross) | 125% | 126%(a) |
| Pupil-teacher ratio primary | 43% | 43%(b) |
| School enrolment secondary (% gross) | 31% | 30%(a) |

| Public responsibility | 1999 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| Public expenditure on health (% of GDP) | 1.7% | 1.3% |
| General government expenditure on health (% of total government expenditure) | 9.9% | 9.8% |
| Out-of-pocket expenditure on health (% of total health expenditure) | 34.3% | 22.4% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of GDP) | 1.8%(c) | 0.6% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of government expenditure) | .. | 1.6% |
| Military expenditure (% of GDP) | 2.1%(d) | .. |
| Military expenditure (% of government final consumption) | .. | .. |
| Prison data and justice | 1990-1995 | 1996-2005 |
| Prison population rates (per 100,000) | .. | .. |
| Pre-trial detainees (% of prison population) | .. | |

## ECONOMY

| Economic overview | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| HDI | 0.518 | 0.655 |
| GDP per capita (constant international US$ at PPP) | 1589.4 | .. |
| Gross domestic savings (% of GDP) | 27.3% | 19.9%(e) |
| Gross fixed capital formation (% of GDP) | 76.3% | 91.6%(e) |
| Net foreign direct investment inflows (as % of GDP) | 77.4% | 49.1% |
| Inflation consumer prices (annual %) | .. | .. |

| Economic overview (continued) | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| General government final consumption expenditure (% of GDP) | 16.4% | 21.0%(e) |
| Agricultural labour force (% of total labour force) | 75%(f) | 69% |
| Military personnel (% of total labour force) | 1.0% | 0.6% |
| **Debt and aid** | | |
| External debt per capita (DOD constant 2000 US$) | 790.2 | 610.6 |
| ■ Debt service total (% of exports) | 2.2% | 2.6%(g) |
| Aid per capita (constant 2000 US$) | 90.9 | 40.7 |
| Aid (% of GNI) | 21.9% | 2.8%(h) |
| 2005 HIPC initiative (decision point/completion point) | .. | |
| **International trade** | | |
| Trade (% of GDP) | 159.4% | 275.2%(e) |
| Food exports (% of merchandise exports) | .. | .. |
| Food imports (% of merchandise imports) | .. | .. |
| Manufactures exports (% of merchandise exports) | .. | .. |
| Manufactures imports (% of merchandise imports) | .. | .. |
| Fuel exports (% of merchandise exports) | .. | .. |
| Fuel imports (% of merchandise imports) | .. | .. |
| **Information and communication technology** | | |
| ■ Fixed line and mobile phone subscribers (per 1,000) | 6.3 | 94.1 |
| Television sets (per 1,000) | 92.3 | 116.0(e) |
| 2004 Total number of permanent post offices (per 100,000) | 4.0 | |
| 1998 Daily newspapers (per 1,000) | 4.6 | |
| **Poverty and inequality** | | |
| National Gini index | .. | |
| ■ Living on less than $1 a day (PPP) (% of population) | .. | |
| ■ Living on less than $2 a day (PPP) (% of population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at national poverty line (% of population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at rural poverty line (% of rural population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at urban poverty line (% of urban population) | .. | |
| HPI-1 rank – income poverty rank | .. | |
| 2003 HDI rank – GDI rank | -1 | |
| **GOVERNANCE** | | |
| **Parliamentary development** | | |
| Lower or single house | Cámara de Representantes del Pueblo | |
| Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Lower or single house | 4/25/04 | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Parliamentary term in lower or single house (years) | 5 | |
| Parliamentarian obligation to declare personal assets | Yes | |
| **Participation** | | |
| Ratio of voters to registered voters (parliamentary) | .. | |
| Ratio of voters to registered voters (presidential) | .. | |
| Year women received right to vote | 1963 | |
| Year women received right to stand for election | 1963 | |
| Parliamentary bodies dealing with human rights | .. | |
| **Aggregate indicators** | | |
| World Bank governance indicators | 1996 | 2004 |
| Voice and accountability | -1.5 | -1.7 |
| Political stability | 0.2(i) | -0.3 |
| Government effectiveness | -1.6 | -1.4 |
| Regulatory quality | -0.9 | -0.8 |
| Rule of law | -1.7(e) | -1.0 |
| Control of corruption | -0.8(e) | -1.6 |
| **ENVIRONMENT** | **1990-1995** | **2000-2004** |
| ■ Proportion of land area covered by forest (%) | 66.2% | 62.5% |
| ■ Ratio of protected area to surface area | 5% | 14% |
| ■ Carbon dioxide emissions (metric tons per capita) | 0.3 | 0.4 |

Notes: (a) 2001/2002; (b) 2001/2002; (c) 1998/1999; (d) 1995; (e) 1998; (f) 1990; (g) 1996; (h) 2001; (i) 2002.

# Eritrea

■ = MDG

## COUNTRY OVERVIEW

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2004 | Population (In millions) | 4.5 | |
| 2004 | Population density (per sq km) | 44.3 | |
| 2004 | Urban population (% of total population) | 20.4% | |
| ■ 2001 | Slum population as percentage of urban population | 70% | |
| 2004 | Population female (% of total) | 50.4% | |
| 2004 | Age dependency ratio (dependents to working-age population) | | 0.87 |
| Indebtedness | | Moderately indebted | |
| Independence date | | 1993 | |

| Committee for Development Policy LDC criteria | Inclusion | Graduation |
|---|---|---|
| Gap to threshold in % of current GNI per capita (US$) | -294.7% | -373.7% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current HAI score | -67.7% | -86.0% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current EVI score | -28.4% | -36.2% |

| MDGs progress | 1990-2000 |
|---|---|
| ■ MDG Hunger | .. |
| ■ MDG Primary education | Low progress |
| ■ MDG Gender equality in education | Reversal/stagnation |
| ■ MDG Child mortality | Low progress |
| ■ MDG Access to water | .. |

## WELL-BEING

| Health | 1990 | 2003 |
|---|---|---|
| Life expectancy at birth (years, male and female combined) | 48.9 | 51.1 |
| Fertility rate (births per woman) | 6.5 | 4.8 |
| ■ Under five mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) | 147 | 85 |
| | 1993-1998 | 1999-2004 |
| Physicians (per 1,000) | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| ■ Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total) | 20.6% | 28.3% |

| Education | 2000-2004 | |
|---|---|---|
| Legal guarantee of primary free education | Progressive realization or partial guarantees | |
| Adult literacy (% of people ages 15 and above) | .. | |
| Youth literacy (% age 15-24) | .. | |
| Ratio of literate females to literate males (ages 15 and above) | .. | |
| Ratio of literate females to males (ages 15-24) | .. | |
| | 1999/2000 | 2002/2003 |
| ■ School enrolment primary (% gross) | 58% | 63% |
| Pupil-teacher ratio primary | 48% | 47% |
| School enrolment secondary (% gross) | 26% | 28% |

| Public responsibility | 1999 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| Public expenditure on health (% of GDP) | 2.5% | 3.2% |
| General government expenditure on health (% of total government expenditure) | 2.7% | 5.6% |
| Out-of-pocket expenditure on health (% of total health expenditure) | 40.3% | 36.3% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of GDP) | 5.0% | 4.1% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of government expenditure) | .. | .. |
| Military expenditure (% of GDP) | 37.6% | 19.4% |
| Military expenditure (% of government final consumption) | 62.0% | 30.1% |
| Prison data and justice | 1990-1995 | 1996-2005 |
| Prison population rates (per 100,000) | .. | .. |
| Pre-trial detainees (% of prison population) | .. | |

## ECONOMY

| Economic overview | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| HDI | 0.409 | 0.444 |
| GDP per capita (constant international US$ at PPP) | 1003.0 | 990.1 |
| Gross domestic savings (% of GDP) | -38.0% | -51.1% |
| Gross fixed capital formation (% of GDP) | 22.5% | 21.8% |
| Net foreign direct investment inflows (as % of GDP) | 0.0% | 2.9% |
| Inflation consumer prices (annual %) | .. | .. |

| Economic overview (continued) | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| General government final consumption expenditure (% of GDP) | 43.9% | 53.7% |
| Agricultural labour force (% of total labour force) | 80%(a) | 77% |
| Military personnel (% of total labour force) | 3.1% | 9.2% |
| **Debt and aid** | | |
| External debt per capita (DOD constant 2000 US$) | 11.2 | 136.6 |
| ■ Debt service total (% of exports) | 3.0%(b) | 14.1% |
| Aid per capita (constant 2000 US$) | 45.3 | 66.1 |
| Aid (% of GNI) | 25.4% | 41.2% |
| 2005 HIPC initiative (decision point/completion point) | .. | |
| **International trade** | | |
| Trade (% of GDP) | 105.3% | 98.5% |
| Food exports (% of merchandise exports) | .. | .. |
| Food imports (% of merchandise imports) | .. | .. |
| Manufactures exports (% of merchandise exports) | .. | .. |
| Manufactures imports (% of merchandise imports) | .. | .. |
| Fuel exports (% of merchandise exports) | .. | .. |
| Fuel imports (% of merchandise imports) | .. | .. |
| **Information and communication technology** | | |
| ■ Fixed line and mobile phone subscribers (per 1,000) | 4.9 | 9.0 |
| Television sets (per 1,000) | 15.8 | 53.0 |
| 2004 Total number of permanent post offices (per 100,000) | 1.5 | |
| Daily newspapers (per 1,000) | .. | |
| **Poverty and inequality** | | |
| National Gini index | .. | |
| ■ Living on less than $1 a day (PPP) (% of population) | 23.0% | |
| ■ Living on less than $2 a day (PPP) (% of population) | .. | |
| 1994 Poverty rate at national poverty line (% of population) | 53.0% | |
| Poverty rate at rural poverty line (% of rural population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at urban poverty line (% of urban population) | .. | |
| HPI-1 rank – income poverty rank | .. | |
| 2003 HDI rank – GDI rank | 0 | |
| **GOVERNANCE** | | |
| **Parliamentary development** | | |
| Lower or single house | Hagerawi Baito | |
| Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Lower or single house | 2/1/94 | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Parliamentary term in lower or single house (years) | 4 | |
| Parliamentarian obligation to declare personal assets | No | |
| **Participation** | | |
| Ratio of voters to registered voters (parliamentary) | .. | |
| Ratio of voters to registered voters (presidential) | .. | |
| Year women received right to vote | 1955 | |
| Year women received right to stand for election | 1955 | |
| Parliamentary bodies dealing with human rights | .. | |
| **Aggregate indicators** | | |
| World Bank governance indicators | 1996 | 2004 |
| Voice and accountability | -1.1 | -2.0 |
| Political stability | 0.5 | -0.1 |
| Government effectiveness | -0.4 | -1.1 |
| Regulatory quality | -0.1 | -1.3 |
| Rule of law | -0.2 | -0.8 |
| Control of corruption | 0.5(b) | -0.6 |
| **ENVIRONMENT** | **1990-1995** | **2000-2004** |
| ■ Proportion of land area covered by forest (%) | 13.9% | 13.5% |
| ■ Ratio of protected area to surface area | 3% | 3% |
| ■ Carbon dioxide emissions (metric tons per capita) | 0.1 | 0.2 |

Notes: (a) 1993; (b) 1998.

# Ethiopia

■ = MDG

## COUNTRY OVERVIEW

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2004 | Population (In millions) | 70.0 | |
| 2004 | Population density (per sq km) | 70.0 | |
| 2004 | Urban population (% of total population) | 15.9% | |
| ■ 2001 | Slum population as percentage of urban population | 99% | |
| 2004 | Population female (% of total) | 49.8% | |
| 2004 | Age dependency ratio (dependents to working-age population) | | 0.92 |
| Indebtedness | | Severely indebted | |
| Independence date | | .. | |

| Committee for Development Policy LDC criteria | Inclusion | Graduation |
|---|---|---|
| Gap to threshold in % of current GNI per capita (US$) | -650.0% | -800.0% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current HAI score | -118.3% | -142.1% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current EVI score | -11.9% | -21.4% |

| MDGs progress | 1990-2000 |
|---|---|
| ■ MDG Hunger | .. |
| ■ MDG Primary education | .. |
| ■ MDG Gender equality in education | Reversal/stagnation |
| ■ MDG Child mortality | Low progress |
| ■ MDG Access to water | Reversal/stagnation |

## WELL-BEING

| Health | 1990 | 2003 |
|---|---|---|
| Life expectancy at birth (years, male and female combined) | 45.0 | 42.0 |
| Fertility rate (births per woman) | 6.9 | 5.6 |
| ■ Under five mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) | 204 | 169 |
| | 1993-1998 | 1999-2004 |
| Physicians (per 1,000) | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| ■ Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total) | .. | 5.6% |

| Education | 2000-2004 | |
|---|---|---|
| Legal guarantee of primary free education | No legal guarantee | |
| Adult literacy (% of people ages 15 and above) | 41.5% | |
| Youth literacy (% age 15-24) | 57.4% | |
| Ratio of literate females to literate males (ages 15 and above) | 68.7% | |
| Ratio of literate females to males (ages 15-24) | 82.2% | |
| | 1999/2000 | 2002/2003 |
| ■ School enrolment primary (% gross) | 55% | 66% |
| Pupil-teacher ratio primary | 54% | 65% |
| School enrolment secondary (% gross) | 14% | 20% |

| Public responsibility | 1999 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| Public expenditure on health (% of GDP) | 2.4% | 2.6% |
| General government expenditure on health (% of total government expenditure) | 7.9% | 7.6% |
| Out-of-pocket expenditure on health (% of total health expenditure) | 40.6% | 36.3% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of GDP) | 4.7% | 4.6%(a) |
| Public expenditure on education (% of government expenditure) | 11.3% | 13.8%(b) |
| Military expenditure (% of GDP) | 10.7% | 4.3% |
| Military expenditure (% of government final consumption) | 57.7% | 18.8% |
| Prison data and justice | 1990-1995 | 1996-2005 |
| Prison population rates (per 100,000) | .. | 92 |
| Pre-trial detainees (% of prison population) | .. | |

## ECONOMY

| Economic overview | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| HDI | 0.323 | 0.367 |
| GDP per capita (constant international US$ at PPP) | 601.3 | 752.5 |
| Gross domestic savings (% of GDP) | 8.0% | 1.3% |
| Gross fixed capital formation (% of GDP) | 16.4% | 19.8% |
| Net foreign direct investment inflows (as % of GDP) | 0.2% | 0.9% |
| Inflation consumer prices (annual %) | 10.0% | 17.8% |

| Economic overview (continued) | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| General government final consumption expenditure (% of GDP) | 11.8% | 22.4% |
| Agricultural labour force (% of total labour force) | 85%(c) | 82% |
| Military personnel (% of total labour force) | 0.5% | 0.5% |
| **Debt and aid** | | |
| External debt per capita (DOD constant 2000 US$) | 198.0 | 98.5 |
| ■ Debt service total (% of exports) | 18.4% | 6.8% |
| Aid per capita (constant 2000 US$) | 17.0 | 20.7 |
| Aid (% of GNI) | 15.4% | 22.8% |
| 2005 HIPC initiative (decision point/completion point) | Country has reached completion point | |
| **International trade** | | |
| Trade (% of GDP) | 35.7% | 53.2% |
| Food exports (% of merchandise exports) | 72.5% | 62.0% |
| Food imports (% of merchandise imports) | 13.8% | 21.5% |
| Manufactures exports (% of merchandise exports) | 11.2% | 11.4% |
| Manufactures imports (% of merchandise imports) | 72.4% | 64.0% |
| Fuel exports (% of merchandise exports) | 2.9% | 0.0% |
| Fuel imports (% of merchandise imports) | 11.1% | 12.0% |
| **Information and communication technology** | | |
| ■ Fixed line and mobile phone subscribers (per 1,000) | 2.5 | 7.7 |
| Television sets (per 1,000) | 4.4 | 6.7 |
| 2004 Total number of permanent post offices (per 100,000) | 0.9 | |
| 1998 Daily newspapers (per 1,000) | 0.4 | |
| **Poverty and inequality** | | |
| 2000 National Gini index | 30.0 | |
| ■ 2000 Living on less than $1 a day (PPP) (% of population) | .. | |
| ■ 2000 Living on less than $2 a day (PPP) (% of population) | 77.8% | |
| 2000 Poverty rate at national poverty line (% of population) | 44.2% | |
| 2000 Poverty rate at rural poverty line (% of rural population) | 45.0% | |
| 2000 Poverty rate at urban poverty line (% of urban population) | 37.0% | |
| 2003 HPI-1 rank – income poverty rank | 23 | |
| 2003 HDI rank – GDI rank | 0 | |
| **GOVERNANCE** | | |
| **Parliamentary development** | | |
| Lower or single house | Yehizb Tewokayoch Mekir Bet | |
| Upper house or senate | Yefedereshein Mekir Bete | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Lower or single house | 5/15/05 | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Upper house or senate | 10/3/05 | |
| Parliamentary term in lower or single house (years) | 5 | |
| Parliamentarian obligation to declare personal assets | No | |
| **Participation** | | |
| 2000 Ratio of voters to registered voters (parliamentary) | 90.0% | |
| Ratio of voters to registered voters (presidential) | .. | |
| Year women received right to vote | 1955 | |
| Year women received right to stand for election | 1955 | |
| 1995 Parliamentary bodies dealing with human rights | Standing Committee on Legal and Administrative Affairs | |
| **Aggregate indicators** | | |
| World Bank governance indicators | 1996 | 2004 |
| Voice and accountability | -0.6 | -1.1 |
| Political stability | -0.6 | -1.0 |
| Government effectiveness | -0.4 | -1.0 |
| Regulatory quality | -0.7 | -1.2 |
| Rule of law | -0.3 | -1.0 |
| Control of corruption | -1.0 | -0.8 |
| **ENVIRONMENT** | **1990-1995** | **2000-2004** |
| ■ Proportion of land area covered by forest (%) | 4.5% | 4.2% |
| ■ Ratio of protected area to surface area | 17% | 17% |
| ■ Carbon dioxide emissions (metric tons per capita) | 0.0 | 0.1 |

Notes: (a) 2001/2002; (b) 2000/2001; (c) 1993.

# Gambia

■ = MDG

## COUNTRY OVERVIEW

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2004 | Population (In millions) | 1.4 | |
| 2004 | Population density (per sq km) | 144.9 | |
| 2004 | Urban population (% of total population) | 26.2% | |
| ■ 2001 | Slum population as percentage of urban population | 67% | |
| 2004 | Population female (% of total) | 50.5% | |
| 2004 | Age dependency ratio (dependents to working-age population) | | 0.78 |
| Indebtedness | | Moderately indebted | |
| Independence date | | 1970 | |

| Committee for Development Policy LDC criteria | Inclusion | Graduation |
|---|---|---|
| Gap to threshold in % of current GNI per capita (US$) | -120.6% | -164.7% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current HAI score | -61.8% | -79.4% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current EVI score | -39.1% | -45.7% |

| MDGs progress | 1990-2000 |
|---|---|
| ■ MDG Hunger | Reversal/stagnation |
| ■ MDG Primary education | Low progress |
| ■ MDG Gender equality in education | Achievable by 2015 |
| ■ MDG Child mortality | Low progress |
| ■ MDG Access to water | .. |

## WELL-BEING

| Health | 1990 | 2003 |
|---|---|---|
| Life expectancy at birth (years, male and female combined) | 49.3 | 53.4 |
| Fertility rate (births per woman) | 5.9 | 4.8 |
| ■ Under five mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) | 154 | 123 |
| | 1993-1998 | 1999-2004 |
| Physicians (per 1,000) | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| ■ Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total) | 44.1% | 54.6% |

| Education | 2000-2004 | |
|---|---|---|
| Legal guarantee of primary free education | Free education guaranteed | |
| Adult literacy (% of people ages 15 and above) | .. | |
| Youth literacy (% age 15-24) | .. | |
| Ratio of literate females to literate males (ages 15 and above) | .. | |
| Ratio of literate females to males (ages 15-24) | .. | |
| | 1999/2000 | 2002/2003 |
| ■ School enrolment primary (% gross) | 80% | 85% |
| Pupil-teacher ratio primary | 37% | 38% |
| School enrolment secondary (% gross) | 33% | 34% |

| Public responsibility | 1999 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| Public expenditure on health (% of GDP) | 2.3% | 3.3% |
| General government expenditure on health (% of total government expenditure) | 10.0% | 12.0% |
| Out-of-pocket expenditure on health (% of total health expenditure) | 42.8% | 35.6% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of GDP) | 3.0% | 2.8% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of government expenditure) | 14.2% | 8.9% |
| Military expenditure (% of GDP) | 0.8% | 0.5% |
| Military expenditure (% of government final consumption) | 6.2% | 3.2% |
| Prison data and justice | 1990-1995 | 1996-2005 |
| Prison population rates (per 100,000) | .. | 32 |
| 1999 Pre-trial detainees (% of prison population) | 18.5% | |

## ECONOMY

| Economic overview | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| HDI | 0.424 | 0.47 |
| GDP per capita (constant international US$ at PPP) | 1573.2 | 1861.6 |
| Gross domestic savings (% of GDP) | -3.9% | 19.6% |
| Gross fixed capital formation (% of GDP) | 20.2% | 23.9% |
| Net foreign direct investment inflows (as % of GDP) | 2.0% | 16.4% |
| Inflation consumer prices (annual %) | 7.0% | 14.2% |

| Economic overview (continued) | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| General government final consumption expenditure (% of GDP) | 13.7% | 10.7% |
| Agricultural labour force (% of total labour force) | 82%(a) | 78% |
| Military personnel (% of total labour force) | 0.1% | 0.1% |
| **Debt and aid** | | |
| External debt per capita (DOD constant 2000 US$) | 415.0 | 418.1 |
| ■ Debt service total (% of exports) | 15.5% | 11.5%(b) |
| Aid per capita (constant 2000 US$) | 45.5 | 39.7 |
| Aid (% of GNI) | 12.4% | 17.2% |
| 2005 HIPC initiative (decision point/completion point) | Country has reached decision point | |
| **International trade** | | |
| Trade (% of GDP) | 122.0% | 75.3% |
| Food exports (% of merchandise exports) | 59.8% | 99.8% |
| Food imports (% of merchandise imports) | 36.4% | 28.4% |
| Manufactures exports (% of merchandise exports) | 36.0% | 17.0% |
| Manufactures imports (% of merchandise imports) | 45.8% | 63.0% |
| Fuel exports (% of merchandise exports) | 0.2% | 0.1%(c) |
| Fuel imports (% of merchandise imports) | 14.1% | 3.6% |
| **Information and communication technology** | | |
| ■ Fixed line and mobile phone subscribers (per 1,000) | 18.9 | 100.8 |
| Television sets (per 1,000) | 3.7 | 14.6 |
| 2004 Total number of permanent post offices (per 100,000) | 1.3 | |
| 1998 Daily newspapers (per 1,000) | 1.7 | |
| **Poverty and inequality** | | |
| 1998 National Gini index | 47.5 | |
| ■ 1992 Living on less than $1 a day (PPP) (% of population) | 53.7% | |
| ■ 1992 Living on less than $2 a day (PPP) (% of population) | 84.0% | |
| 1998 Poverty rate at national poverty line (% of population) | 57.6% | |
| 1998 Poverty rate at rural poverty line (% of rural population) | 61.0% | |
| 1998 Poverty rate at urban poverty line (% of urban population) | 48.0% | |
| 2003 HPI-1 rank – income poverty rank | -5 | |
| 2003 HDI rank – GDI rank | 1 | |

**GOVERNANCE**

| Parliamentary development | |
|---|---|
| Lower or single house | National Assembly |
| Upper house or senate | .. |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Lower or single house | 1/17/02 |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Upper house or senate | .. |
| Parliamentary term in lower or single house (years) | 5 |
| Parliamentarian obligation to declare personal assets | No |
| **Participation** | |
| 1997 Ratio of voters to registered voters (parliamentary) | 73.2% |
| 1996 Ratio of voters to registered voters (presidential) | 80.0% |
| Year women received right to vote | 1960 |
| Year women received right to stand for election | 1960 |
| Parliamentary bodies dealing with human rights | .. |

| Aggregate indicators | | |
|---|---|---|
| World Bank governance indicators | 1996 | 2004 |
| Voice and accountability | -1.3 | -0.6 |
| Political stability | 0.2 | 0.4 |
| Government effectiveness | -0.1 | -0.5 |
| Regulatory quality | -1.3 | -0.1 |
| Rule of law | 0.2 | -0.3 |
| Control of corruption | 0.4 | -0.6 |

| ENVIRONMENT | 1990-1995 | 2000-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| ■ Proportion of land area covered by forest (%) | 43.6% | 48.1% |
| ■ Ratio of protected area to surface area | 4% | 4% |
| ■ Carbon dioxide emissions (metric tons per capita) | 0.2 | 0.2 |

Notes: (a) 1990; (b) 1997; (c) 2000.

# Guinea

■ = MDG

## COUNTRY OVERVIEW

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2004 | Population (In millions) | 8.1 | |
| 2004 | Population density (per sq km) | 32.9 | |
| 2004 | Urban population (% of total population) | 35.7% | |
| ■ 2001 | Slum population as percentage of urban population | 72% | |
| 2004 | Population female (% of total) | 49.7% | |
| 2004 | Age dependency ratio (dependents to working-age population) | | 0.85 |
| Indebtedness | | Moderately indebted | |
| Independence date | | 1958 | |

| Committee for Development Policy LDC criteria | Inclusion | Graduation |
|---|---|---|
| Gap to threshold in % of current GNI per capita (US$) | -67.8% | -101.3% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current HAI score | -81.5% | -101.3% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current EVI score | -12.1% | -21.6% |

| MDGs progress | 1990-2000 |
|---|---|
| ■ MDG Hunger | Achievable by 2015 |
| ■ MDG Primary education | .. |
| ■ MDG Gender equality in education | Low progress |
| ■ MDG Child mortality | Achievable by 2015 |
| ■ MDG Access to water | Low progress |

## WELL-BEING

| Health | 1990 | 2003 |
|---|---|---|
| Life expectancy at birth (years, male and female combined) | 42.4 | 46.2 |
| Fertility rate (births per woman) | 5.9 | 5.0 |
| ■ Under five mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) | 240 | 160 |
| | 1993-1998 | 1999-2004 |
| Physicians (per 1,000) | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| ■ Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total) | 30.5% | 34.8% |

| Education | 2000-2004 | |
|---|---|---|
| Legal guarantee of primary free education | No legal guarantee | |
| Adult literacy (% of people ages 15 and above) | .. | |
| Youth literacy (% age 15-24) | .. | |
| Ratio of literate females to literate males (ages 15 and above) | .. | |
| Ratio of literate females to males (ages 15-24) | .. | |
| | 1999/2000 | 2002/2003 |
| ■ School enrolment primary (% gross) | 63% | 81% |
| Pupil-teacher ratio primary | 46% | 45% |
| School enrolment secondary (% gross) | 14%(a) | 24% |

| Public responsibility | 1999 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| Public expenditure on health (% of GDP) | 0.9% | 0.9% |
| General government expenditure on health (% of total government expenditure) | 5.4% | 4.8% |
| Out-of-pocket expenditure on health (% of total health expenditure) | 83.2% | 84.1% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of GDP) | 2.0% | 1.8%(b) |
| Public expenditure on education (% of government expenditure) | 25.8%(a) | 25.6%(b) |
| Military expenditure (% of GDP) | 1.6% | 2.9% |
| Military expenditure (% of government final consumption) | 40.7% | 70.4% |
| Prison data and justice | 1990-1995 | 1996-2005 |
| Prison population rates (per 100,000) | .. | 37 |
| 2002 Pre-trial detainees (% of prison population) | 51.3% | |

## ECONOMY

| Economic overview | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| HDI | .. | 0.466 |
| GDP per capita (constant international US$ at PPP) | 1795.5 | 1996.2 |
| Gross domestic savings (% of GDP) | 12.8% | 8.6% |
| Gross fixed capital formation (% of GDP) | 16.6% | 10.5% |
| Net foreign direct investment inflows (as % of GDP) | 0.0% | 2.2% |
| Inflation consumer prices (annual %) | .. | .. |

| Economic overview (continued) | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| General government final consumption expenditure (% of GDP) | 6.2% | 5.6% |
| Agricultural labour force (% of total labour force) | 87%(c) | 83% |
| Military personnel (% of total labour force) | 0.6% | 0.3% |
| **Debt and aid** | | |
| External debt per capita (DOD constant 2000 US$) | 534.1 | 412.9 |
| ■ Debt service total (% of exports) | 25.0% | 15.1% |
| Aid per capita (constant 2000 US$) | 68.7 | 28.4 |
| Aid (% of GNI) | 11.6% | 6.6% |
| 2005 HIPC initiative (decision point/completion point) | Country has reached decision point | |
| **International trade** | | |
| Trade (% of GDP) | 45.3% | 48.1% |
| Food exports (% of merchandise exports) | 7.6% | 2.0% |
| Food imports (% of merchandise imports) | 31.0% | 23.1% |
| Manufactures exports (% of merchandise exports) | 24.3% | 25.3% |
| Manufactures imports (% of merchandise imports) | 47.3% | 52.9% |
| Fuel exports (% of merchandise exports) | 0.0%(d) | 0.1% |
| Fuel imports (% of merchandise imports) | 19.0% | 21.7% |
| **Information and communication technology** | | |
| ■ Fixed line and mobile phone subscribers (per 1,000) | 1.7 | 17.8 |
| Television sets (per 1,000) | 15.7 | 17.2 |
| 2004 Total number of permanent post offices (per 100,000) | 0.8 | |
| Daily newspapers (per 1,000) | .. | |
| **Poverty and inequality** | | |
| 1994 National Gini index | 40.3 | |
| ■ Living on less than $1 a day (PPP) (% of population) | .. | |
| ■ Living on less than $2 a day (PPP) (% of population) | .. | |
| 1994 Poverty rate at national poverty line (% of population) | 40.0% | |
| Poverty rate at rural poverty line (% of rural population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at urban poverty line (% of urban population) | .. | |
| HPI-1 rank – income poverty rank | .. | |
| HDI rank – GDI rank | .. | |
| **GOVERNANCE** | | |
| **Parliamentary development** | | |
| Lower or single house | Assemblée Nationale | |
| Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Lower or single house | 6/30/02 | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Parliamentary term in lower or single house (years) | 5 | |
| Parliamentarian obligation to declare personal assets | No | |
| **Participation** | | |
| 2002 Ratio of voters to registered voters (parliamentary) | 72.0% | |
| 1998 Ratio of voters to registered voters (presidential) | 69.8% | |
| Year women received right to vote | 1958 | |
| Year women received right to stand for election | 1958 | |
| Parliamentary bodies dealing with human rights | .. | |
| **Aggregate indicators** | | |
| World Bank governance indicators | 1996 | 2004 |
| Voice and accountability | -1.1 | -1.1 |
| Political stability | -1.3 | -0.9 |
| Government effectiveness | -1.2 | -0.9 |
| Regulatory quality | 0.0 | -0.9 |
| Rule of law | -1.1 | -1.1 |
| Control of corruption | 0.4 | -0.8 |
| **ENVIRONMENT** | **1990-1995** | **2000-2004** |
| ■ Proportion of land area covered by forest (%) | 29.6% | 28.2% |
| ■ Ratio of protected area to surface area | 6% | 6% |
| ■ Carbon dioxide emissions (metric tons per capita) | 0.2 | 0.1 |

Notes: (a) 1998/1999; (b) 2000/2001; (c) 1990; (d) 1996.

# Guinea-Bissau

■ = MDG

## COUNTRY OVERVIEW

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2004 | Population (In millions) | 1.5 | |
| 2004 | Population density (per sq km) | 54.5 | |
| 2004 | Urban population (% of total population) | 34.8% | |
| ■ 2001 | Slum population as percentage of urban population | 93% | |
| 2004 | Population female (% of total) | 50.6% | |
| 2004 | Age dependency ratio (dependents to working-age population) | | 0.93 |
| Indebtedness | | Severely indebted | |
| Independence date | | 1974 | |

| Committee for Development Policy LDC criteria | Inclusion | Graduation |
|---|---|---|
| Gap to threshold in % of current GNI per capita (US$) | -341.2% | -429.4% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current HAI score | -76.3% | -95.5% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current EVI score | -42.7% | -48.9% |

| MDGs progress | 1990-2000 |
|---|---|
| ■ MDG Hunger | .. |
| ■ MDG Primary education | .. |
| ■ MDG Gender equality in education | .. |
| ■ MDG Child mortality | Low progress |
| ■ MDG Access to water | .. |

## WELL-BEING

| Health | 1990 | 2003 |
|---|---|---|
| Life expectancy at birth (years, male and female combined) | 43.7 | 45.5 |
| Fertility rate (births per woman) | 7.1 | 6.6 |
| ■ Under five mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) | 253 | 204 |
| | 1993-1998 | 1999-2004 |
| Physicians (per 1,000) | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| ■ Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total) | 25.0% | 34.7% |

| Education | 2000-2004 | |
|---|---|---|
| Legal guarantee of primary free education | Free education guaranteed | |
| Adult literacy (% of people ages 15 and above) | .. | |
| Youth literacy (% age 15-24) | .. | |
| Ratio of literate females to literate males (ages 15 and above) | .. | |
| Ratio of literate females to males (ages 15-24) | .. | |
| | 1999/2000 | 2002/2003 |
| ■ School enrolment primary (% gross) | 70% | 70%(a) |
| Pupil-teacher ratio primary | 44% | 44%(a) |
| School enrolment secondary (% gross) | 18% | 18%(a) |

| Public responsibility | 1999 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| Public expenditure on health (% of GDP) | 2.1% | 3.0% |
| General government expenditure on health (% of total government expenditure) | 6.6% | 8.5% |
| Out-of-pocket expenditure on health (% of total health expenditure) | 58.2% | 51.8% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of GDP) | 2.1% | .. |
| Public expenditure on education (% of government expenditure) | 4.8% | .. |
| Military expenditure (% of GDP) | 1.4%(b) | 3.1%(c) |
| Military expenditure (% of government final consumption) | 15.6% | 28.5%(c) |
| Prison data and justice | 1990-1995 | 1996-2005 |
| Prison population rates (per 100,000) | .. | .. |
| Pre-trial detainees (% of prison population) | .. | |

## ECONOMY

| Economic overview | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| HDI | 0.341 | 0.348 |
| GDP per capita (constant international US$ at PPP) | 920.9 | 667.1 |
| Gross domestic savings (% of GDP) | -1.2% | 4.0% |
| Gross fixed capital formation (% of GDP) | 22.3% | 12.4% |
| Net foreign direct investment inflows (as % of GDP) | 0.0% | 0.9% |
| Inflation consumer prices (annual %) | 45.4% | 0.9% |

| Economic overview (continued) | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| General government final consumption expenditure (% of GDP) | 6.4% | 14.1% |
| Agricultural labour force (% of total labour force) | 85%(d) | 82% |
| Military personnel (% of total labour force) | 1.7% | 2.1% |
| **Debt and aid** | | |
| External debt per capita (DOD constant 2000 US$) | 819.7 | 472.7 |
| ■ Debt service total (% of exports) | 51.7% | 15.1% |
| Aid per capita (constant 2000 US$) | 108.1 | 92.1 |
| Aid (% of GNI) | 50.2% | 63.6% |
| 2005 HIPC initiative (decision point/completion point) | Country has reached decision point | |
| **International trade** | | |
| Trade (% of GDP) | 46.8% | 75.1% |
| Food exports (% of merchandise exports) | 89.1% | .. |
| Food imports (% of merchandise imports) | 43.6% | .. |
| Manufactures exports (% of merchandise exports) | 0.2% | .. |
| Manufactures imports (% of merchandise imports) | 39.6% | .. |
| Fuel exports (% of merchandise exports) | .. | .. |
| Fuel imports (% of merchandise imports) | 16.2% | .. |
| **Information and communication technology** | | |
| ■ Fixed line and mobile phone subscribers (per 1,000) | 6.9 | 9.2 |
| Television sets (per 1,000) | 28.1(e) | 40.4 |
| 2004 Total number of permanent post offices (per 100,000) | 1.3 | |
| 1998 Daily newspapers (per 1,000) | 4.8 | |
| **Poverty and inequality** | | |
| 1993 National Gini index | 47.0 | |
| ■ Living on less than $1 a day (PPP) (% of population) | .. | |
| ■ Living on less than $2 a day (PPP) (% of population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at national poverty line (% of population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at rural poverty line (% of rural population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at urban poverty line (% of urban population) | .. | |
| HPI-1 rank – income poverty rank | .. | |
| 2003 HDI rank – GDI rank | 0 | |
| **GOVERNANCE** | | |
| **Parliamentary development** | | |
| Lower or single house | Assembleia Nacional Popular | |
| Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Lower or single house | 3/28/04 | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Parliamentary term in lower or single house (years) | 4 | |
| Parliamentarian obligation to declare personal assets | No | |
| Participation | | |
| 1999 Ratio of voters to registered voters (parliamentary) | 80.0% | |
| 1999 Ratio of voters to registered voters (presidential) | 71.9% | |
| Year women received right to vote | 1977 | |
| Year women received right to stand for election | 1977 | |
| Parliamentary bodies dealing with human rights | .. | |
| **Aggregate indicators** | | |
| World Bank governance indicators | 1996 | 2004 |
| Voice and accountability | -0.6 | -0.6 |
| Political stability | -0.6 | -0.5 |
| Government effectiveness | -0.9 | -1.2 |
| Regulatory quality | -0.1 | -0.9 |
| Rule of law | -1.6 | -1.3 |
| Control of corruption | -1.0 | -0.7 |
| **ENVIRONMENT** | **1990-1995** | **2000-2004** |
| ■ Proportion of land area covered by forest (%) | 66.5% | 60.5% |
| ■ Ratio of protected area to surface area | .. | .. |
| ■ Carbon dioxide emissions (metric tons per capita) | 0.2 | 0.2 |

Notes: (a) 2000/2001; (b) 1998; (c) 2001; (d) 1990; (e) 1999.

# Haiti

■ = MDG

## COUNTRY OVERVIEW

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2004 | Population (In millions) | 8.6 | |
| 2004 | Population density (per sq km) | 311.7 | |
| 2004 | Urban population (% of total population) | 38.1% | |
| ■ 2001 | Slum population as percentage of urban population | 86% | |
| 2004 | Population female (% of total) | 50.8% | |
| 2004 | Age dependency ratio (dependents to working-age population) | | 0.72 |
| Indebtedness | | Less indebted | |
| Independence date | | 1804 | |

| Committee for Development Policy LDC criteria | Inclusion | Graduation |
|---|---|---|
| Gap to threshold in % of current GNI per capita (US$) | -52.1% | -82.6% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current HAI score | -55.8% | -72.8% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current EVI score | -11.3% | -20.9% |

| MDGs progress | 1990-2000 |
|---|---|
| ■ MDG Hunger | Achievable by 2015 |
| ■ MDG Primary education | .. |
| ■ MDG Gender equality in education | .. |
| ■ MDG Child mortality | Low progress |
| ■ MDG Access to water | Reversal/stagnation |

## WELL-BEING

| Health | 1990 | 2003 |
|---|---|---|
| Life expectancy at birth (years, male and female combined) | 53.1 | 51.9 |
| Fertility rate (births per woman) | 5.4 | 4.2 |
| ■ Under five mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) | 150 | 118 |
| | 1993-1998 | 1999-2004 |
| Physicians (per 1,000) | 0.3 | 0.3 |
| ■ Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total) | 19.5% | 23.8% |

| Education | 2000-2004 | |
|---|---|---|
| Legal guarantee of primary free education | No legal guarantee | |
| Adult literacy (% of people ages 15 and above) | 51.9% | |
| Youth literacy (% age 15-24) | 66.2% | |
| Ratio of literate females to literate males (ages 15 and above) | 93.0% | |
| Ratio of literate females to males (ages 15-24) | 101.1% | |
| | 1999/2000 | 2002/2003 |
| ■ School enrolment primary (% gross) | .. | .. |
| Pupil-teacher ratio primary | .. | .. |
| School enrolment secondary (% gross) | .. | .. |

| Public responsibility | 1999 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| Public expenditure on health (% of GDP) | 2.5% | 3.0% |
| General government expenditure on health (% of total government expenditure) | 18.5% | 23.8% |
| Out-of-pocket expenditure on health (% of total health expenditure) | 43.9% | 42.1% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of GDP) | .. | .. |
| Public expenditure on education (% of government expenditure) | .. | .. |
| Military expenditure (% of GDP) | .. | .. |
| Military expenditure (% of government final consumption) | .. | .. |
| Prison data and justice | 1990-1995 | 1996-2005 |
| Prison population rates (per 100,000) | 23 | 42 |
| 1999 Pre-trial detainees (% of prison population) | 83.5% | |

## ECONOMY

| Economic overview | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| HDI | 0.45 | 0.475 |
| GDP per capita (constant international US$ at PPP) | 1723.2 | 1559.2 |
| Gross domestic savings (% of GDP) | -7.8% | .. |
| Gross fixed capital formation (% of GDP) | 11.1% | 23.3% |
| Net foreign direct investment inflows (as % of GDP) | 0.2% | 0.3% |
| Inflation consumer prices (annual %) | 27.6% | 22.8% |

| Economic overview (continued) | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| General government final consumption expenditure (% of GDP) | 6.8% | 5.4% |
| Agricultural labour force (% of total labour force) | 68%(a) | 61% |
| Military personnel (% of total labour force) | 0.2% | 0.1% |
| **Debt and aid** | | |
| External debt per capita (DOD constant 2000 US$) | 123.6 | 146.4 |
| ■ Debt service total (% of exports) | 50.2% | 4.1% |
| Aid per capita (constant 2000 US$) | 110.0 | 22.4 |
| Aid (% of GNI) | 23.8% | 6.9% |
| 2005 HIPC initiative (decision point/completion point) | .. | |
| **International trade** | | |
| Trade (% of GDP) | 40.8% | 50.1% |
| Food exports (% of merchandise exports) | 37.5% | 15.5% |
| Food imports (% of merchandise imports) | .. | .. |
| Manufactures exports (% of merchandise exports) | 62.1% | 84.0%(b) |
| Manufactures imports (% of merchandise imports) | .. | .. |
| Fuel exports (% of merchandise exports) | 0.0%(c) | 0.0% |
| Fuel imports (% of merchandise imports) | .. | .. |
| **Information and communication technology** | | |
| ■ Fixed line and mobile phone subscribers (per 1,000) | 8.4 | 55.2 |
| Television sets (per 1,000) | 34.8 | 60.1 |
| 2004 Total number of permanent post offices (per 100,000) | 0.6 | |
| Daily newspapers (per 1,000) | .. | |
| **Poverty and inequality** | | |
| National Gini index | .. | |
| ■ 2001 Living on less than $1 a day (PPP) (% of population) | 67.0% | |
| ■ Living on less than $2 a day (PPP) (% of population) | 83.3% | |
| Poverty rate at national poverty line (% of population) | .. | |
| 1995 Poverty rate at rural poverty line (% of rural population) | 66.0% | |
| Poverty rate at urban poverty line (% of urban population) | .. | |
| HPI-1 rank – income poverty rank | .. | |
| HDI rank – GDI rank | .. | |
| **GOVERNANCE** | | |
| **Parliamentary development** | | |
| Lower or single house | Chambre des Députés | |
| Upper house or senate | Sénat | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Lower or single house | 5/21/00 | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Upper house or senate | 5/21/00 | |
| Parliamentary term in lower or single house (years) | 4 | |
| Parliamentarian obligation to declare personal assets | No | |
| **Participation** | | |
| 2000 Ratio of voters to registered voters (parliamentary) | 60.0% | |
| 2000 Ratio of voters to registered voters (presidential) | 60.0% | |
| Year women received right to vote | 1950 | |
| Year women received right to stand for election | 1950 | |
| Parliamentary bodies dealing with human rights | .. | |
| **Aggregate indicators** | | |
| World Bank governance indicators | 1996 | 2004 |
| Voice and accountability | -0.5 | -1.5 |
| Political stability | -0.2 | -1.9 |
| Government effectiveness | -1.4 | -1.9 |
| Regulatory quality | -1.2 | -1.1 |
| Rule of law | -1.2 | -1.7 |
| Control of corruption | -1.0 | -1.5 |
| **ENVIRONMENT** | **1990-1995** | **2000-2004** |
| ■ Proportion of land area covered by forest (%) | 5.7% | 3.2% |
| ■ Ratio of protected area to surface area | 0% | 0% |
| ■ Carbon dioxide emissions (metric tons per capita) | 0.1 | 0.2 |

Notes: (a)1990; (b) 1997; (c) 1991.

# Kiribati

■ = MDG

## COUNTRY OVERVIEW

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2004 | Population (In millions) | 0.1 | |
| 2004 | Population density (per sq km) | 134.0 | |
| 2004 | Urban population (% of total population) | 48.7% | |
| ■ 2001 | Slum population as percentage of urban population | 56% | |
| 2004 | Population female (% of total) | 49.5% | |
| 2004 | Age dependency ratio (dependents to working-age population) | | 0.69 |
| Indebtedness | | Not classified | |
| Independence date | | 1979 | |

| Committee for Development Policy LDC criteria | Inclusion | Graduation |
|---|---|---|
| Gap to threshold in % of current GNI per capita (US$) | 18.7% | 2.5% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current HAI score | 18.5% | 9.6% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current EVI score | -42.9% | -49.1% |

| MDGs progress | 1990-2000 |
|---|---|
| ■ MDG Hunger | .. |
| ■ MDG Primary education | .. |
| ■ MDG Gender equality in education | .. |
| ■ MDG Child mortality | Low progress |
| ■ MDG Access to water | .. |

## WELL-BEING

| Health | 1990 | 2003 |
|---|---|---|
| Life expectancy at birth (years, male and female combined) | 56.8 | 63.1 |
| Fertility rate (births per woman) | 4.0 | 3.6 |
| ■ Under five mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) | 88 | 66 |
| | 1993-1998 | 1999-2004 |
| Physicians (per 1,000) | 0.3 | 0.3 |
| ■ Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total) | 72.0% | 85.0%(a) |

| Education | 2000-2004 | |
|---|---|---|
| Legal guarantee of primary free education | No legal guarantee | |
| Adult literacy (% of people ages 15 and above) | .. | |
| Youth literacy (% age 15-24) | .. | |
| Ratio of literate females to literate males (ages 15 and above) | .. | |
| Ratio of literate females to males (ages 15-24) | .. | |
| | 1999/2000 | 2002/2003 |
| ■ School enrolment primary (% gross) | 131%(b) | 111% |
| Pupil-teacher ratio primary | 24%(b) | 22% |
| School enrolment secondary (% gross) | .. | 104% |

| Public responsibility | 1999 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| Public expenditure on health (% of GDP) | 7.4% | 7.9% |
| General government expenditure on health (% of total government expenditure) | 9.7% | 10.2% |
| Out-of-pocket expenditure on health (% of total health expenditure) | 1.1% | 1.2% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of GDP) | .. | .. |
| Public expenditure on education (% of government expenditure) | .. | .. |
| Military expenditure (% of GDP) | .. | .. |
| Military expenditure (% of government final consumption) | .. | .. |
| Prison data and justice | 1990-1995 | 1996-2005 |
| Prison population rates (per 100,000) | 117 | 67 |
| 2004 Pre-trial detainees (% of prison population) | 6.2% | |

## ECONOMY

| Economic overview | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| HDI | .. | .. |
| GDP per capita (constant international US$ at PPP) | .. | .. |
| Gross domestic savings (% of GDP) | -45.1% | .. |
| Gross fixed capital formation (% of GDP) | 55.8%(c) | .. |
| Net foreign direct investment inflows (as % of GDP) | .. | .. |
| Inflation consumer prices (annual %) | .. | .. |

| Economic overview (continued) | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| General government final consumption expenditure (% of GDP) | 54.2% | .. |
| Agricultural labour force (% of total labour force) | 30%(d) | 26% |
| Military personnel (% of total labour force) | .. | .. |
| **Debt and aid** | | |
| External debt per capita (DOD constant 2000 US$) | .. | .. |
| ■ Debt service total (% of exports) | .. | .. |
| Aid per capita (constant 2000 US$) | 209.2 | 180.1 |
| Aid (% of GNI) | 19.3% | 20.3% |
| 2005 HIPC initiative (decision point/completion point) | .. | |
| **International trade** | | |
| Trade (% of GDP) | 104.6% | 94.1%(e) |
| Food exports (% of merchandise exports) | 97.8% | 91.5% |
| Food imports (% of merchandise imports) | 39.4% | 36.8%(f) |
| Manufactures exports (% of merchandise exports) | 0.0% | 0.0%(f) |
| Manufactures imports (% of merchandise imports) | 47.9% | 49.4%(f) |
| Fuel exports (% of merchandise exports) | 54.9% | 50.7%(f) |
| Fuel imports (% of merchandise imports) | 10.1% | 10.4%(f) |
| **Information and communication technology** | | |
| ■ Fixed line and mobile phone subscribers (per 1,000) | 26.1 | 57.3 |
| Television sets (per 1,000) | 20.0 | 43.8 |
| 2003 Total number of permanent post offices (per 100,000) | 25.9 | |
| Daily newspapers (per 1,000) | .. | |
| **Poverty and inequality** | | |
| National Gini index | .. | |
| ■ Living on less than $1 a day (PPP) (% of population) | .. | |
| ■ Living on less than $2 a day (PPP) (% of population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at national poverty line (% of population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at rural poverty line (% of rural population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at urban poverty line (% of urban population) | .. | |
| HPI-1 rank – income poverty rank | .. | |
| HDI rank – GDI rank | .. | |
| **GOVERNANCE** | | |
| **Parliamentary development** | | |
| Lower or single house | Maneaba Ni Maungatabu | |
| Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Lower or single house | 5/9/03 | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Parliamentary term in lower or single house (years) | 4 | |
| Parliamentarian obligation to declare personal assets | No | |
| **Participation** | | |
| 1983 Ratio of voters to registered voters (parliamentary) | 79.9% | |
| Ratio of voters to registered voters (presidential) | .. | |
| Year women received right to vote | 1967 | |
| Year women received right to stand for election | 1967 | |
| Parliamentary bodies dealing with human rights | .. | |
| **Aggregate indicators** | | |
| World Bank governance indicators | 1996 | 2004 |
| Voice and accountability | 1.2 | 0.9 |
| Political stability | .. | 0.8 |
| Government effectiveness | -0.4 | -0.6 |
| Regulatory quality | -0.4 | -0.5 |
| Rule of law | -0.7(a) | 0.2 |
| Control of corruption | -0.5(a) | 0.0 |
| **Environment** | **1990-1995** | **2000-2004** |
| ■ Proportion of land area covered by forest (%) | 38.4% | 38.4% |
| ■ Ratio of protected area to surface area | 1% | 2% |
| ■ Carbon dioxide emissions (metric tons per capita) | 0.3 | 0.3 |

Notes: (a) 1998; (b) 1998/1999; (c) 1992; (d) 1990; (e) 2000; (f) 1999.

# Lao People´s Democratic Republic

■ = MDG

## COUNTRY OVERVIEW

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2004 | Population (In millions) | 5.8 | |
| 2004 | Population density (per sq km) | 25.1 | |
| 2004 | Urban population (% of total population) | 21.2% | |
| ■ 2001 | Slum population as percentage of urban population | 66% | |
| 2004 | Population female (% of total) | 50.0% | |
| 2004 | Age dependency ratio (dependents to working-age population) | | 0.82 |
| Indebtedness | | Severely indebted | |
| Independence date | | 1954 | |

| Committee for Development Policy LDC criteria | Inclusion | Graduation |
|---|---|---|
| Gap to threshold in % of current GNI per capita (US$) | -152.5% | -203.0% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current HAI score | -18.5% | -31.5% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current EVI score | -15.7% | -24.8% |
| MDGs progress | 1990-2000 | |
| ■ MDG Hunger | Low progress | |
| ■ MDG Primary education | Achievable by 2015 | |
| ■ MDG Gender equality in education | Low progress | |
| ■ MDG Child mortality | Achievable by 2015 | |
| ■ MDG Access to water | .. | |

## WELL-BEING

| Health | 1990 | 2003 |
|---|---|---|
| Life expectancy at birth (years, male and female combined) | 49.7 | 54.7 |
| Fertility rate (births per woman) | 6.0 | 4.8 |
| ■ Under five mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) | 163 | 91 |
| | 1993-1998 | 1999-2004 |
| Physicians (per 1,000) | 0.6 | 0.6 |
| ■ Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total) | .. | 19.4% |
| Education | 2000-2004 | |
| Legal guarantee of primary free education | No legal guarantee | |
| Adult literacy (% of people ages 15 and above) | 68.7% | |
| Youth literacy (% age 15-24) | 78.5% | |
| Ratio of literate females to literate males (ages 15 and above) | 79.1% | |
| Ratio of literate females to males (ages 15-24) | 90.4% | |
| | 1999/2000 | 2002/2003 |
| ■ School enrolment primary (% gross) | 115% | 116% |
| Pupil-teacher ratio primary | 30% | 31% |
| School enrolment secondary (% gross) | 36% | 44% |
| Public responsibility | 1999 | 2002-2004 |
| Public expenditure on health (% of GDP) | 1.5% | 1.5% |
| General government expenditure on health (% of total government expenditure) | 8.8% | 8.7% |
| Out-of-pocket expenditure on health (% of total health expenditure) | 40.5% | 39.3% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of GDP) | 2.0% | 2.8% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of government expenditure) | 7.4% | 11.0% |
| Military expenditure (% of GDP) | 2.2% | 2.1%(a) |
| Military expenditure (% of government final consumption) | .. | .. |
| Prison data and justice | 1990-1995 | 1996-2005 |
| Prison population rates (per 100,000) | .. | 69 |
| 2004 Pre-trial detainees (% of prison population) | 1.0% | |

## ECONOMY

| Economic overview | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| HDI | 0.487 | 0.545 |
| GDP per capita (constant international US$ at PPP) | 1258.5 | 1790.7 |
| Gross domestic savings (% of GDP) | 11.9% | 20.5% |
| Gross fixed capital formation (% of GDP) | 26.0% | 18.9% |
| Net foreign direct investment inflows (as % of GDP) | 5.4% | 0.9% |
| Inflation consumer prices (annual %) | 19.6% | 10.5% |
| General government final consumption expenditure (% of GDP) | 8.3% | 5.2% |

| Economic overview (continued) | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| Agricultural labour force (% of total labour force) | 78%(b) | 76% |
| Military personnel (% of total labour force) | 6.0% | 4.5% |
| **Debt and aid** | | |
| External debt per capita (DOD constant 2000 US$) | 501.7 | 475.1 |
| ■ Debt service total (% of exports) | 6.3% | 9.4% |
| Aid per capita (constant 2000 US$) | 71.5 | 49.8 |
| Aid (% of GNI) | 17.6% | 14.9% |
| 2005 HIPC initiative (decision point/completion point) | Country still to be considered | |
| **International trade** | | |
| Trade (% of GDP) | 60.6% | 50.8% |
| Food exports (% of merchandise exports) | .. | .. |
| Food imports (% of merchandise imports) | .. | .. |
| Manufactures exports (% of merchandise exports) | .. | .. |
| Manufactures imports (% of merchandise imports) | .. | .. |
| Fuel exports (% of merchandise exports) | .. | .. |
| Fuel imports (% of merchandise imports) | .. | .. |
| **Information and communication technology** | | |
| ■ Fixed line and mobile phone subscribers (per 1,000) | 3.9 | 32.0 |
| Television sets (per 1,000) | 9.8 | 54.2 |
| 2004 Total number of permanent post offices (per 100,000) | 4.0 | |
| Daily newspapers (per 1,000) | .. | |
| **Poverty and inequality** | | |
| 1997 National Gini index | 37.0 | |
| ■ 1997 Living on less than $1 a day (PPP) (% of population) | 26.3% | |
| ■ 1997 Living on less than $2 a day (PPP) (% of population) | 73.2% | |
| 1998 Poverty rate at national poverty line (% of population) | 38.6% | |
| 1998 Poverty rate at rural poverty line (% of rural population) | 41.0% | |
| 1998 Poverty rate at urban poverty line (% of urban population) | 26.9% | |
| 2003 HPI-1 rank – income poverty rank | 2 | |
| 2003 HDI rank – GDI rank | 0 | |
| **GOVERNANCE** | | |
| **Parliamentary development** | | |
| Lower or single house | Sapha Heng Xat | |
| Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Lower or single house | 24-Feb-02 | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Parliamentary term in lower or single house (years) | 5 | |
| Parliamentarian obligation to declare personal assets | No | |
| **Participation** | | |
| Ratio of voters to registered voters (parliamentary) | .. | |
| Ratio of voters to registered voters (presidential) | .. | |
| Year women received right to vote | 1958 | |
| Year women received right to stand for election | 1958 | |
| Parliamentary bodies dealing with human rights | .. | |
| **Aggregate indicators** | | |
| World Bank governance indicators | 1996 | 2004 |
| Voice and accountability | -1.1 | -1.5 |
| Political stability | 1.2 | -0.8 |
| Government effectiveness | 0.0 | -1.0 |
| Regulatory quality | -1.2 | -1.2 |
| Rule of law | -1.4 | -1.3 |
| Control of corruption | -0.9 | -1.1 |
| **ENVIRONMENT** | **1990-1995** | **2000-2004** |
| ■ Proportion of land area covered by forest (%) | 56.7% | 54.4% |
| ■ Ratio of protected area to surface area | 14% | 16% |
| ■ Carbon dioxide emissions (metric tons per capita) | 0.1 | 0.2 |

Notes: (a) 2001; (b) 1990.

# Lesotho

■ = MDG

## COUNTRY OVERVIEW

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2004 | Population (In millions) | 1.8 | |
| 2004 | Population density (per sq km) | 59.6 | |
| 2004 | Urban population (% of total population) | 18.1% | |
| ■ 2001 | Slum population as percentage of urban population | 57% | |
| 2004 | Population female (% of total) | 52.5% | |
| 2004 | Age dependency ratio (dependents to working-age population) | | 0.86 |
| Indebtedness | | Less indebted | |
| Independence date | | 1966 | |

| Committee for Development Policy LDC criteria | Inclusion | Graduation |
|---|---|---|
| Gap to threshold in % of current GNI per capita (US$) | -30.9% | -57.1% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current HAI score | -21.1% | -34.4% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current EVI score | -16.3% | -25.3% |

| MDGs progress | 1990-2000 |
|---|---|
| ■ MDG Hunger | Low progress |
| ■ MDG Primary education | Low progress |
| ■ MDG Gender equality in education | Achieved |
| ■ MDG Child mortality | Low progress |
| ■ MDG Access to water | .. |

## WELL-BEING

| Health | 1990 | 2003 |
|---|---|---|
| Life expectancy at birth (years, male and female combined) | 57.6 | 37.2 |
| Fertility rate (births per woman) | 5.1 | 4.3 |
| ■ Under five mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) | 104 | 110 |
| | 1993-1998 | 1999-2004 |
| Physicians (per 1,000) | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| ■ Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total) | 49.6% | 59.8% |

| Education | 2000-2004 | |
|---|---|---|
| Legal guarantee of primary free education | Progressive realization or partial guarantees | |
| Adult literacy (% of people ages 15 and above) | 81.4% | |
| Youth literacy (% age 15-24) | .. | |
| Ratio of literate females to literate males (ages 15 and above) | 122.5% | |
| Ratio of literate females to males (ages 15-24) | .. | |
| | 1999/2000 | 2002/2003 |
| ■ School enrolment primary (% gross) | 108% | 126% |
| Pupil-teacher ratio primary | 44% | 47% |
| School enrolment secondary (% gross) | 32% | 35% |

| Public responsibility | 1999 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| Public expenditure on health (% of GDP) | 4.4% | 5.3% |
| General government expenditure on health (% of total government expenditure) | 7.2% | 10.9% |
| Out-of-pocket expenditure on health (% of total health expenditure) | 1.4% | 1.1% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of GDP) | 10.1% | 8.9%(a) |
| Public expenditure on education (% of government expenditure) | 18.5% | .. |
| Military expenditure (% of GDP) | 3.7% | 2.6% |
| Military expenditure (% of government final consumption) | 19.5% | 14.0% |
| Prison data and justice | 1990-1995 | 1996-2005 |
| Prison population rates (per 100,000) | .. | 156 |
| 2005 Pre-trial detainees (% of prison population) | 16.3% | |

## ECONOMY

| Economic overview | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| HDI | 0.573 | 0.497 |
| GDP per capita (constant international US$ at PPP) | 1745.9 | 2403.1 |
| Gross domestic savings (% of GDP) | -38.4% | -24.2% |
| Gross fixed capital formation (% of GDP) | 61.2% | 40.5% |
| Net foreign direct investment inflows (as % of GDP) | 29.5% | 3.9% |
| Inflation consumer prices (annual %) | 9.3% | 6.7% |

| Economic overview (continued) | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| General government final consumption expenditure (% of GDP) | 17.9% | 20.8% |
| Agricultural labour force (% of total labour force) | 41%(b) | 39% |
| Military personnel (% of total labour force) | 0.3% | 0.3% |
| **Debt and aid** | | |
| External debt per capita (DOD constant 2000 US$) | 447.7 | 372.3 |
| ■ Debt service total (% of exports) | 6.1% | 8.7% |
| Aid per capita (constant 2000 US$) | 74.4 | 41.6 |
| Aid (% of GNI) | 8.6% | 6.0% |
| 2005 HIPC initiative (decision point/completion point) | .. | |
| **International trade** | | |
| Trade (% of GDP) | 141.4% | 129.6% |
| Food exports (% of merchandise exports) | .. | .. |
| Food imports (% of merchandise imports) | .. | .. |
| Manufactures exports (% of merchandise exports) | .. | .. |
| Manufactures imports (% of merchandise imports) | .. | .. |
| Fuel exports (% of merchandise exports) | .. | .. |
| Fuel imports (% of merchandise imports) | .. | .. |
| **Information and communication technology** | | |
| ■ Fixed line and mobile phone subscribers (per 1,000) | 8.8 | 55.7 |
| Television sets (per 1,000) | 12.3 | 36.8 |
| 2004 Total number of permanent post offices (per 100,000) | 8.5 | |
| 1998 Daily newspapers (per 1,000) | 9.0 | |
| **Poverty and inequality** | | |
| 1995 National Gini index | 63.2 | |
| ■ 1995 Living on less than $1 a day (PPP) (% of population) | 36.4% | |
| ■ 1995 Living on less than $2 a day (PPP) (% of population) | 56.1% | |
| Poverty rate at national poverty line (% of population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at rural poverty line (% of rural population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at urban poverty line (% of urban population) | .. | |
| 2003 HPI-1 rank – income poverty rank | 9 | |
| 2003 HDI rank – GDI rank | 2 | |
| **GOVERNANCE** | | |
| **Parliamentary development** | | |
| Lower or single house | National Assembly | |
| Upper house or senate | Senate | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Lower or single house | 5/25/02 | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Upper house or senate | 5/26/02 | |
| Parliamentary term in lower or single house (years) | 5 | |
| Parliamentarian obligation to declare personal assets | Yes | |
| **Participation** | | |
| 2002 Ratio of voters to registered voters (parliamentary) | 66.7% | |
| Ratio of voters to registered voters (presidential) | .. | |
| Year women received right to vote | 1965 | |
| Year women received right to stand for election | 1965 | |
| Parliamentary bodies dealing with human rights | Parliament | |
| **Aggregate indicators** | | |
| World Bank governance indicators | 1996 | 2004 |
| Voice and accountability | 0.0 | 0.3 |
| Political stability | 1.0 | 0.3 |
| Government effectiveness | 0.2 | -0.3 |
| Regulatory quality | -0.7 | -0.3 |
| Rule of law | -0.3 | 0.0 |
| Control of corruption | 0.0(c) | 0.0 |
| **ENVIRONMENT** | **1990-1995** | **2000-2004** |
| ■ Proportion of land area covered by forest (%) | 0.5% | 0.5% |
| ■ Ratio of protected area to surface area | 0% | 0% |
| ■ Carbon dioxide emissions (metric tons per capita) | .. | .. |

Notes: (a) 2001/2002; (b) 1990; (c) 1998.

# Liberia

■ = MDG

## COUNTRY OVERVIEW

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2004 | Population (In millions) | 3.4 | |
| 2004 | Population density (per sq km) | 35.8 | |
| 2004 | Urban population (% of total population) | 47.3% | |
| ■ 2001 | Slum population as percentage of urban population | 56% | |
| 2004 | Population female (% of total) | 49.8% | |
| 2004 | Age dependency ratio (dependents to working-age population) | | 0.88 |
| Indebtedness | | Severely indebted | |
| Independence date | | 1822 | |

| Committee for Development Policy LDC criteria | Inclusion | Graduation |
|---|---|---|
| Gap to threshold in % of current GNI per capita (US$) | -163.2% | -215.8% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current HAI score | -42.1% | -57.6% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current EVI score | -41.4% | -47.7% |

| MDGs progress | 1990-2000 |
|---|---|
| ■ MDG Hunger | Reversal/stagnation |
| ■ MDG Primary education | .. |
| ■ MDG Gender equality in education | .. |
| ■ MDG Child mortality | Reversal/stagnation |
| ■ MDG Access to water | .. |

## WELL-BEING

| Health | 1990 | 2003 |
|---|---|---|
| Life expectancy at birth (years, male and female combined) | 45.1 | 47.1 |
| Fertility rate (births per woman) | 6.8 | 5.8 |
| ■ Under five mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) | 235 | 235 |
| | 1993-1998 | 1999-2004 |
| Physicians (per 1,000) | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| ■ Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total) | .. | 50.9% |

| Education | 2000-2004 | |
|---|---|---|
| Legal guarantee of primary free education | Progressive realization or partial guarantees | |
| Adult literacy (% of people ages 15 and above) | 55.9% | |
| Youth literacy (% age 15-24) | 70.8% | |
| Ratio of literate females to literate males (ages 15 and above) | 54.4% | |
| Ratio of literate females to males (ages 15-24) | 64.2% | |
| | 1999/2000 | 2002/2003 |
| ■ School enrolment primary (% gross) | 105% | .. |
| Pupil-teacher ratio primary | 38% | .. |
| School enrolment secondary (% gross) | 34% | .. |

| Public responsibility | 1999 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| Public expenditure on health (% of GDP) | 4.2% | 1.4% |
| General government expenditure on health (% of total government expenditure) | 11.4% | 5.5% |
| Out-of-pocket expenditure on health (% of total health expenditure) | 18.1% | 30.6% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of GDP) | .. | .. |
| Public expenditure on education (% of government expenditure) | .. | .. |
| Military expenditure (% of GDP) | 31.2%(a) | 7.5% |
| Military expenditure (% of government final consumption) | .. | .. |
| Prison data and justice | 1990-1995 | 1996-2005 |
| Prison population rates (per 100,000) | .. | .. |
| Pre-trial detainees (% of prison population) | .. | |

## ECONOMY

| Economic overview | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| HDI | .. | .. |
| GDP per capita (constant international US$ at PPP) | .. | .. |
| Gross domestic savings (% of GDP) | .. | .. |
| Gross fixed capital formation (% of GDP) | 5.0%(b) | 13.5% |
| Net foreign direct investment inflows (as % of GDP) | 3.4% | 0.0% |
| Inflation consumer prices (annual %) | .. | .. |

| Economic overview (continued) | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| General government final consumption expenditure (% of GDP) | .. | 10.7% |
| Agricultural labour force (% of total labour force) | 72%(c) | 67% |
| Military personnel (% of total labour force) | 2.2% | 1.1% |
| **Debt and aid** | | |
| External debt per capita (DOD constant 2000 US$) | 856.0 | 719.0 |
| ■ Debt service total (% of exports) | 0.8%(d) | 0.1% |
| Aid per capita (constant 2000 US$) | 49.1 | 29.9 |
| Aid (% of GNI) | 28.8%(d) | 28.3% |
| 2005 HIPC initiative (decision point/completion point) | Country still to be considered | |
| **International trade** | | |
| Trade (% of GDP) | .. | .. |
| Food exports (% of merchandise exports) | .. | .. |
| Food imports (% of merchandise imports) | .. | .. |
| Manufactures exports (% of merchandise exports) | .. | .. |
| Manufactures imports (% of merchandise imports) | .. | .. |
| Fuel exports (% of merchandise exports) | .. | .. |
| Fuel imports (% of merchandise imports) | .. | .. |
| **Information and communication technology** | | |
| ■ Fixed line and mobile phone subscribers (per 1,000) | 1.6 | 2.8(b) |
| Television sets (per 1,000) | 20.3 | 25.4(e) |
| 2000 Total number of permanent post offices (per 100,000) | 0.4 | |
| 1998 Daily newspapers (per 1,000) | 14.2 | |
| **Poverty and inequality** | | |
| National Gini index | .. | |
| ■ Living on less than $1 a day (PPP) (% of population) | .. | |
| ■ Living on less than $2 a day (PPP) (% of population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at national poverty line (% of population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at rural poverty line (% of rural population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at urban poverty line (% of urban population) | .. | |
| HPI-1 rank – income poverty rank | .. | |
| HDI rank – GDI rank | .. | |

**GOVERNANCE**

| Parliamentary development | |
|---|---|
| Lower or single house | House of Representatives |
| Upper house or senate | Senate |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Lower or single house | 10/11/05 |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Upper house or senate | 10/11/05 |
| Parliamentary term in lower or single house (years) | 6 |
| Parliamentarian obligation to declare personal assets | No |
| **Participation** | |
| Ratio of voters to registered voters (parliamentary) | .. |
| Ratio of voters to registered voters (presidential) | .. |
| Year women received right to vote | 1946 |
| Year women received right to stand for election | 1946 |
| Parliamentary bodies dealing with human rights | .. |

| Aggregate indicators | | |
|---|---|---|
| World Bank governance indicators | 1996 | 2004 |
| Voice and accountability | -1.4 | -1.2 |
| Political stability | -2.4 | -2.2 |
| Government effectiveness | -2.2 | -1.9 |
| Regulatory quality | -2.9 | -1.8 |
| Rule of law | -2.2 | -1.8 |
| Control of corruption | -1.7 | -0.9 |

| ENVIRONMENT | 1990-1995 | 2000-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| ■ Proportion of land area covered by forest (%) | 38.1% | 31.3% |
| ■ Ratio of protected area to surface area | 13% | 13% |
| ■ Carbon dioxide emissions (metric tons per capita) | 0.2 | 0.1 |

Notes: (a) 1994; (b) 2001; (c) 1990; (d) 1997; (e) 2000.

# Madagascar

■ = MDG

## COUNTRY OVERVIEW

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2004 | Population (In millions) | 17.3 | |
| 2004 | Population density (per sq km) | 29.8 | |
| 2004 | Urban population (% of total population) | 26.8% | |
| ■ 2001 | Slum population as percentage of urban population | 93% | |
| 2004 | Population female (% of total) | 50.0% | |
| 2004 | Age dependency ratio (dependents to working-age population) | | 0.88 |
| Indebtedness | | Less indebted | |
| Independence date | | 1960 | |

| Committee for Development Policy LDC criteria | Inclusion | Graduation |
|---|---|---|
| Gap to threshold in % of current GNI per capita (US$) | -196.4% | -255.7% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current HAI score | -45.1% | -60.9% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current EVI score | 71.3% | 52.8% |

| MDGs progress | 1990-2000 |
|---|---|
| ■ MDG Hunger | Reversal/stagnation |
| ■ MDG Primary education | .. |
| ■ MDG Gender equality in education | Achieved |
| ■ MDG Child mortality | Low progress |
| ■ MDG Access to water | Low progress |

## WELL-BEING

| Health | 1990 | 2003 |
|---|---|---|
| Life expectancy at birth (years, male and female combined) | 52.8 | 55.7 |
| Fertility rate (births per woman) | 6.2 | 5.2 |
| ■ Under five mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) | 168 | 126 |
| | 1993-1998 | 1999-2004 |
| Physicians (per 1,000) | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| ■ Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total) | 47.3% | 46.2% |

| Education | 2000-2004 | |
|---|---|---|
| Legal guarantee of primary free education | Free education guaranteed | |
| Adult literacy (% of people ages 15 and above) | 70.6% | |
| Youth literacy (% age 15-24) | 70.1% | |
| Ratio of literate females to literate males (ages 15 and above) | 85.3% | |
| Ratio of literate females to males (ages 15-24) | 94.1% | |
| | 1999/2000 | 2002/2003 |
| ■ School enrolment primary (% gross) | 102%(a) | 120% |
| Pupil-teacher ratio primary | 48% | 52% |
| School enrolment secondary (% gross) | 14% | .. |

| Public responsibility | 1999 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| Public expenditure on health (% of GDP) | 1.2% | 1.2% |
| General government expenditure on health (% of total government expenditure) | 6.9% | 8.0% |
| Out-of-pocket expenditure on health (% of total health expenditure) | 41.5% | 40.0% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of GDP) | 2.5% | 2.9%(b) |
| Public expenditure on education (% of government expenditure) | 10.2%(a) | .. |
| Military expenditure (% of GDP) | 1.2% | 1.4%(c) |
| Military expenditure (% of government final consumption) | 18.5% | 19.3%(c) |
| Prison data and justice | 1990-1995 | 1996-2005 |
| Prison population rates (per 100,000) | 151 | 109 |
| 1999 Pre-trial detainees (% of prison population) | 65.4% | |

## ECONOMY

| Economic overview | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| HDI | 0.458 | 0.499 |
| GDP per capita (constant international US$ at PPP) | 821.3 | 787.4 |
| Gross domestic savings (% of GDP) | 3.4% | 8.8% |
| Gross fixed capital formation (% of GDP) | 10.9% | 24.4% |
| Net foreign direct investment inflows (as % of GDP) | 0.3% | 0.2% |
| Inflation consumer prices (annual %) | 49.1% | 13.8% |

| Economic overview (continued) | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| General government final consumption expenditure (% of GDP) | 6.7% | 9.2% |
| Agricultural labour force (% of total labour force) | 78%(d) | 73% |
| Military personnel (% of total labour force) | 0.4% | 0.3% |
| **Debt and aid** | | |
| External debt per capita (DOD constant 2000 US$) | 352.9 | 277.3 |
| ■ Debt service total (% of exports) | 7.6% | 6.1% |
| Aid per capita (constant 2000 US$) | 24.6 | 30.2 |
| Aid (% of GNI) | 10.0% | 10.0% |
| 2005 HIPC initiative (decision point/completion point) | Country has reached completion point | |
| **International trade** | | |
| Trade (% of GDP) | 55.8% | 71.7% |
| Food exports (% of merchandise exports) | 69.1% | 55.5% |
| Food imports (% of merchandise imports) | 16.3% | 16.3% |
| Manufactures exports (% of merchandise exports) | 14.4% | 38.4% |
| Manufactures imports (% of merchandise imports) | 65.0% | 71.9% |
| Fuel exports (% of merchandise exports) | 1.5% | 0.4% |
| Fuel imports (% of merchandise imports) | 14.0% | 10.2% |
| **Information and communication technology** | | |
| ■ Fixed line and mobile phone subscribers (per 1,000) | 3.0 | 21.0 |
| Television sets (per 1,000) | 11.6 | 17.6 |
| 2004 Total number of permanent post offices (per 100,000) | 3.6 | |
| 1998 Daily newspapers (per 1,000) | 4.5 | |
| **Poverty and inequality** | | |
| 2001 National Gini index | 47.5 | |
| ■ 2001 Living on less than $1 a day (PPP) (% of population) | 61.0% | |
| ■ 2001 Living on less than $2 a day (PPP) (% of population) | 85.1% | |
| 1999 Poverty rate at national poverty line (% of population) | 71.3% | |
| 1999 Poverty rate at rural poverty line (% of rural population) | 76.7% | |
| 1999 Poverty rate at urban poverty line (% of urban population) | 52.1% | |
| 2003 HPI-1 rank – income poverty rank | -23 | |
| 2003 HDI rank – GDI rank | -3 | |
| **GOVERNANCE** | | |
| **Parliamentary development** | | |
| Lower or single house | Antenimieram-Pirenena | |
| Upper house or senate | Sénat | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Lower or single house | 12/15/02 | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Upper house or senate | 3/18/01 | |
| Parliamentary term in lower or single house (years) | 5 | |
| Parliamentarian obligation to declare personal assets | No | |
| **Participation** | | |
| 2002 Ratio of voters to registered voters (parliamentary) | 67.9% | |
| 1996 Ratio of voters to registered voters (presidential) | 60.9% | |
| Year women received right to vote | 1959 | |
| Year women received right to stand for election | 1959 | |
| Parliamentary bodies dealing with human rights | .. | |
| **Aggregate indicators** | | |
| World Bank governance indicators | 1996 | 2004 |
| Voice and accountability | 0.3 | 0.1 |
| Political stability | 0.2 | 0.0 |
| Government effectiveness | -0.6 | -0.4 |
| Regulatory quality | -0.1 | 0.1 |
| Rule of law | -0.8 | -0.3 |
| Control of corruption | 0.4 | -0.2 |
| **ENVIRONMENT** | **1990-1995** | **2000-2004** |
| ■ Proportion of land area covered by forest (%) | 22.2% | 20.2% |
| ■ Ratio of protected area to surface area | 2% | 3% |
| ■ Carbon dioxide emissions (metric tons per capita) | 0.1 | 0.1 |

Notes: (a) 1998/1999; (b) 2001/2002; (c) 2001; (d) 1990.

# Malawi

■ = MDG

## COUNTRY OVERVIEW

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2004 | Population (In millions) | 11.2 | |
| 2004 | Population density (per sq km) | 118.9 | |
| 2004 | Urban population (% of total population) | 16.7% | |
| ■ 2001 | Slum population as percentage of urban population | 91% | |
| 2004 | Population female (% of total) | 50.7% | |
| 2004 | Age dependency ratio (dependents to working-age population) | | 0.94 |
| Indebtedness | | Moderately indebted | |
| Independence date | | 1964 | |

| Committee for Development Policy LDC criteria | Inclusion | Graduation |
|---|---|---|
| Gap to threshold in % of current GNI per capita (US$) | -323.7% | -408.5% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current HAI score | -41.0% | -56.4% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current EVI score | -24.5% | -32.7% |

| MDGs progress | 1990-2000 |
|---|---|
| ■ MDG Hunger | Achievable by 2015 |
| ■ MDG Primary education | Achieved |
| ■ MDG Gender equality in education | Achievable by 2015 |
| ■ MDG Child mortality | Low progress |
| ■ MDG Access to water | Low progress |

## WELL-BEING

| Health | 1990 | 2003 |
|---|---|---|
| Life expectancy at birth (years, male and female combined) | 44.6 | 37.5 |
| Fertility rate (births per woman) | 7.0 | 6.0 |
| ■ Under five mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) | 241 | 178 |
| | 1993-1998 | 1999-2004 |
| Physicians (per 1,000) | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| ■ Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total) | 54.8% | 61.0% |

| Education | 2000-2004 | |
|---|---|---|
| Legal guarantee of primary free education | Free education guaranteed | |
| 1998 Adult literacy (% of people ages 15 and above) | 64.1% | |
| 1998 Youth literacy (% age 15-24) | 76.3% | |
| 1998 Ratio of literate females to literate males (ages 15 and above) | 72.1% | |
| Education | 1998 | Ratio of literate |
| females to males (ages 15-24) | 86.1% | |
| | 1999/2000 | 2002/2003 |
| ■ School enrolment primary (% gross) | 143% | 140% |
| Pupil-teacher ratio primary | 63% | 62% |
| School enrolment secondary (% gross) | 38% | 33% |

| Public responsibility | 1999 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| Public expenditure on health (% of GDP) | 2.9% | 4.0% |
| General government expenditure on health (% of total government expenditure) | 9.7% | 9.7% |
| Out-of-pocket expenditure on health (% of total health expenditure) | 28.6% | 25.1% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of GDP) | 4.1% | 6.0% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of government expenditure) | 24.6%(a) | .. |
| Military expenditure (% of GDP) | 0.8% | 0.8%(b) |
| Military expenditure (% of government final consumption) | 5.6% | 5.1%(b) |
| Prison data and justice | 1990-1995 | 1996-2005 |
| Prison population rates (per 100,000) | 44 | 70 |
| 2003 Pre-trial detainees (% of prison population) | 23.5% | |

## ECONOMY

| Economic overview | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| HDI | 0.412 | 0.404 |
| GDP per capita (constant international US$ at PPP) | 560.8 | 584.7 |
| Gross domestic savings (% of GDP) | -0.3% | 0.0% |
| Gross fixed capital formation (% of GDP) | 14.8% | 10.3% |
| Net foreign direct investment inflows (as % of GDP) | -1.4% | 1.4% |

| Economic overview (continued) | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| Inflation consumer prices (annual %) | 83.3% | 9.6% |
| General government final consumption expenditure (% of GDP) | 21.0% | 15.2% |
| Agricultural labour force (% of total labour force) | 87%(c) | 82% |
| Military personnel (% of total labour force) | 0.2% | 0.1% |
| **Debt and aid** | | |
| External debt per capita (DOD constant 2000 US$) | 264.4 | 270.1 |
| ■ Debt service total (% of exports) | 24.9% | 8.0% |
| Aid per capita (constant 2000 US$) | 51.3 | 42.9 |
| Aid (% of GNI) | 32.2% | 30.0% |
| 2005 HIPC initiative (decision point/completion point) | Country has reached decision point | |
| **International trade** | | |
| Trade (% of GDP) | 76.7% | 65.5% |
| Food exports (% of merchandise exports) | 90.4% | 86.1% |
| Food imports (% of merchandise imports) | 13.9% | 16.9% |
| Manufactures exports (% of merchandise exports) | 7.3% | 11.8% |
| Manufactures imports (% of merchandise imports) | 73.4% | 68.6% |
| Fuel exports (% of merchandise exports) | 0.1% | 0.0% |
| Fuel imports (% of merchandise imports) | 11.1% | 11.9% |
| **Information and communication technology** | | |
| ■ Fixed line and mobile phone subscribers (per 1,000) | 3.7 | 21.0 |
| Television sets (per 1,000) | 2.1 | 5.9 |
| 2004 Total number of permanent post offices (per 100,000) | 2.9 | |
| 1998 Daily newspapers (per 1,000) | 2.5 | |
| **Poverty and inequality** | | |
| 1997 National Gini index | 50.3 | |
| ■ 1997 Living on less than $1 a day (PPP) (% of population) | 41.7% | |
| ■ 1997 Living on less than $2 a day (PPP) (% of population) | 76.1% | |
| 1998 Poverty rate at national poverty line (% of population) | 65.3% | |
| 1998 Poverty rate at rural poverty line (% of rural population) | 66.5% | |
| 1998 Poverty rate at urban poverty line (% of urban population) | 54.9% | |
| 2003 HPI-1 rank – income poverty rank | 0 | |
| 2003 HDI rank – GDI rank | 0 | |
| **GOVERNANCE** | | |
| **Parliamentary development** | | |
| Lower or single house | National Assembly | |
| Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Lower or single house | 5/20/04 | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Parliamentary term in lower or single house (years) | 5 | |
| Parliamentarian obligation to declare personal assets | No | |
| **Participation** | | |
| 1999 Ratio of voters to registered voters (parliamentary) | 92.3% | |
| 1999 Ratio of voters to registered voters (presidential) | 93.8% | |
| Year women received right to vote | 1961 | |
| Year women received right to stand for election | 1961 | |
| Parliamentary bodies dealing with human rights | .. | |
| **Aggregate indicators** | | |
| World Bank governance indicators | 1996 | 2004 |
| Voice and accountability | -0.4 | -0.5 |
| Political stability | 0.1 | -0.3 |
| Government effectiveness | -0.7 | -0.8 |
| Regulatory quality | -0.4 | -0.6 |
| Rule of law | -0.2 | -0.3 |
| Control of corruption | -1.0 | -0.8 |
| **ENVIRONMENT** | **1990-1995** | **2000-2004** |
| ■ Proportion of land area covered by forest (%) | 34.7% | 27.2% |
| ■ Ratio of protected area to surface area | 16% | 16% |
| ■ Carbon dioxide emissions (metric tons per capita) | 0.1 | 0.1 |

Notes: (a) 1998/1999; (b) 2001; (c) 1990

# Maldives

■ = MDG

## COUNTRY OVERVIEW

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2004 | Population (In millions) | 0.3 | |
| 2004 | Population density (per sq km) | 998.4 | |
| 2004 | Urban population (% of total population) | 29.3% | |
| ■ 2001 | Slum population as percentage of urban population | 0% | |
| 2004 | Population female (% of total) | 49.5% | |
| 2004 | Age dependency ratio (dependents to working-age population) | | 0.73 |
| Indebtedness | | Less indebted | |
| Independence date | | 1965 | |

| Committee for Development Policy LDC criteria | Inclusion | Graduation |
|---|---|---|
| Gap to threshold in % of current GNI per capita (US$) | 62.2% | 54.6% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current HAI score | 15.6% | 6.4% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current EVI score | 10.1% | -1.8% |

| MDGs progress | 1990-2000 |
|---|---|
| ■ MDG Hunger | .. |
| ■ MDG Primary education | Achieved |
| ■ MDG Gender equality in education | Achieved |
| ■ MDG Child mortality | Achievable by 2015 |
| ■ MDG Access to water | Achieved |

## WELL-BEING

| Health | 1990 | 2003 |
|---|---|---|
| Life expectancy at birth (years, male and female combined) | 61.7 | 69.5 |
| Fertility rate (births per woman) | 5.7 | 4.0 |
| ■ Under five mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) | 115 | 72 |
| | 1993-1998 | 1999-2004 |
| Physicians (per 1,000) | 0.4 | 0.8 |
| ■ Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total) | 90.0% | 70.3% |

| Education | 2000-2004 | |
|---|---|---|
| Legal guarantee of primary free education | No legal guarantee | |
| Adult literacy (% of people ages 15 and above) | 96.3% | |
| Youth literacy (% age 15-24) | 98.2% | |
| Ratio of literate females to literate males (ages 15 and above) | 100.2% | |
| Ratio of literate females to males (ages 15-24) | 100.3% | |
| | 1999/2000 | 2002/2003 |
| ■ School enrolment primary (% gross) | 134% | 118% |
| Pupil-teacher ratio primary | 24% | 20% |
| School enrolment secondary (% gross) | 43% | 67% |

| Public responsibility | 1999 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| Public expenditure on health (% of GDP) | 3.9% | 4.0% |
| General government expenditure on health (% of total government expenditure) | 13.2% | 12.5% |
| Out-of-pocket expenditure on health (% of total health expenditure) | 14.8% | 12.3% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of GDP) | 3.7%(a) | .. |
| Public expenditure on education (% of government expenditure) | 11.2%(a) | .. |
| Military expenditure (% of GDP) | .. | .. |
| Military expenditure (% of government final consumption) | .. | .. |
| Prison data and justice | 1990-1995 | 1996-2005 |
| Prison population rates (per 100,000) | .. | 414 |
| Pre-trial detainees (% of prison population) | .. | |

## ECONOMY

| Economic overview | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| HDI | .. | 0.745 |
| GDP per capita (constant international US$ at PPP) | .. | .. |
| Gross domestic savings (% of GDP) | 46.8% | 51.4% |
| Gross fixed capital formation (% of GDP) | 31.5% | 25.5% |
| Net foreign direct investment inflows (as % of GDP) | 1.8% | 2.0% |
| Inflation consumer prices (annual %) | 5.5% | 6.4% |

| Economic overview (continued) | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| General government final consumption expenditure (% of GDP) | 16.8% | 23.2% |
| Agricultural labour force (% of total labour force) | 33%(b) | 21% |
| Military personnel (% of total labour force) | 4.6%(c) | 4.3%(d) |
| **Debt and aid** | | |
| External debt per capita (DOD constant 2000 US$) | 692.2 | 905.8 |
| ■ Debt service total (% of exports) | 3.4% | 3.6% |
| Aid per capita (constant 2000 US$) | 258.9 | 57.9 |
| Aid (% of GNI) | 15.3% | 2.8% |
| 2005 HIPC initiative (decision point/completion point) | .. | |
| **International trade** | | |
| Trade (% of GDP) | 169.9% | 151.3% |
| Food exports (% of merchandise exports) | 73.8% | 67.7% |
| Food imports (% of merchandise imports) | 23.9% | 20.9% |
| Manufactures exports (% of merchandise exports) | 25.3% | 32.0% |
| Manufactures imports (% of merchandise imports) | 60.7% | 63.0% |
| Fuel exports (% of merchandise exports) | .. | .. |
| Fuel imports (% of merchandise imports) | 11.4% | 11.7% |
| **Information and communication technology** | | |
| ■ Fixed line and mobile phone subscribers (per 1,000) | 56.7 | 251.1 |
| Television sets (per 1,000) | 61.7 | 131.0 |
| 2004 Total number of permanent post offices (per 100,000) | 72.1 | |
| Daily newspapers (per 1,000) | .. | |
| **Poverty and inequality** | | |
| National Gini index | .. | |
| ■ Living on less than $1 a day (PPP) (% of population) | .. | |
| ■ Living on less than $2 a day (PPP) (% of population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at national poverty line (% of population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at rural poverty line (% of rural population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at urban poverty line (% of urban population) | .. | |
| HPI-1 rank – income poverty rank | .. | |
| HDI rank – GDI rank | .. | |
| **GOVERNANCE** | | |
| **Parliamentary development** | | |
| Lower or single house | Majlis | |
| Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Lower or single house | 1/22/05 | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Parliamentary term in lower or single house (years) | 5 | |
| Parliamentarian obligation to declare personal assets | No | |
| **Participation** | | |
| 1994 Ratio of voters to registered voters (parliamentary) | 75.4% | |
| 1998 Ratio of voters to registered voters (presidential) | 76.7% | |
| Year women received right to vote | 1932 | |
| Year women received right to stand for election | 1932 | |
| Parliamentary bodies dealing with human rights | .. | |
| **Aggregate indicators** | | |
| World Bank governance indicators | 1996 | 2004 |
| Voice and accountability | -1.0 | -1.1 |
| Political stability | 1.3(e) | 0.8 |
| Government effectiveness | -0.1 | 0.5 |
| Regulatory quality | 0.2 | 0.0 |
| Rule of law | -0.7(c) | -0.6 |
| Control of corruption | -0.5(c) | 0.1 |
| **ENVIRONMENT** | **1990-1995** | **2000-2004** |
| ■ Proportion of land area covered by forest (%) | 3.3% | 3.3% |
| ■ Ratio of protected area to surface area | .. | .. |
| ■ Carbon dioxide emissions (metric tons per capita) | 1.1 | 3.4 |

Notes: (a) 1998/1999; (b) 1990; (c) 1998; (d) 2000; (e) 2002.

# Mali

■ = MDG

## COUNTRY OVERVIEW

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2004 | Population (In millions) | 11.9 | |
| 2004 | Population density (per sq km) | 9.8 | |
| 2004 | Urban population (% of total population) | 33.0% | |
| ■ 2001 | Slum population as percentage of urban population | 93% | |
| 2004 | Population female (% of total) | 50.9% | |
| 2004 | Age dependency ratio (dependents to working-age population) | | 0.99 |
| Indebtedness | | Moderately indebted | |
| Independence date | | 1960 | |

| Committee for Development Policy LDC criteria | Inclusion | Graduation |
|---|---|---|
| Gap to threshold in % of current GNI per capita (US$) | -226.1% | -291.3% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current HAI score | -176.4% | -206.5% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current EVI score | -22.1% | -30.5% |

| MDGs progress | 1990-2000 |
|---|---|
| ■ MDG Hunger | Achievable by 2015 |
| ■ MDG Primary education | Low progress |
| ■ MDG Gender equality in education | Low progress |
| ■ MDG Child mortality | Low progress |
| ■ MDG Access to water | Achievable by 2015 |

## WELL-BEING

| Health | 1990 | 2003 |
|---|---|---|
| Life expectancy at birth (years, male and female combined) | 45.0 | 40.6 |
| Fertility rate (births per woman) | 6.7(a) | 6.4 |
| ■ Under five mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) | 250 | 220 |
| | 1993-1998 | 1999-2004 |
| Physicians (per 1,000) | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| ■ Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total) | 23.7% | 40.6% |

| Education | 2000-2004 | |
|---|---|---|
| Legal guarantee of primary free education | Free education guaranteed | |
| 1998 Adult literacy (% of people ages 15 and above) | 19.0% | |
| 1998 Youth literacy (% age 15-24) | 24.2% | |
| 1998 Ratio of literate females to literate males (ages 15 and above) | 44.5% | |
| Education | 1998 | Ratio of literate |
| females to males (ages 15-24) | 52.3% | |
| | 1999/2000 | 2002/2003 |
| ■ School enrolment primary (% gross) | 50% | 58% |
| Pupil-teacher ratio primary | 65% | 57% |
| School enrolment secondary (% gross) | 15% | 20% |

| Public responsibility | 1999 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| Public expenditure on health (% of GDP) | 1.8% | 2.3% |
| General government expenditure on health (% of total government expenditure) | 6.6% | 9.0% |
| Out-of-pocket expenditure on health (% of total health expenditure) | 51.0% | 43.7% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of GDP) | 3.0% | .. |
| Public expenditure on education (% of government expenditure) | .. | .. |
| Military expenditure (% of GDP) | 2.0% | 1.9%(b) |
| Military expenditure (% of government final consumption) | 19.5% | 14.4% |
| Prison data and justice | 1990-1995 | 1996-2005 |
| Prison population rates (per 100,000) | 41 | 34 |
| 2002 Pre-trial detainees (% of prison population) | 67.2% | |

## ECONOMY

| Economic overview | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| HDI | 0.307 | 0.333 |
| GDP per capita (constant international US$ at PPP) | 697.9 | 952.9 |
| Gross domestic savings (% of GDP) | 7.8% | 18.9% |
| Gross fixed capital formation (% of GDP) | 22.9% | 19.7% |
| Net foreign direct investment inflows (as % of GDP) | 4.5% | 3.0% |

| Economic overview (continued) | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| Inflation consumer prices (annual %) | 13.4% | -3.1% |
| General government final consumption expenditure (% of GDP) | 9.7% | 10.1% |
| Agricultural labour force (% of total labour force) | 86%(c) | 80% |
| Military personnel (% of total labour force) | 0.3% | 0.2% |
| **Debt and aid** | | |
| External debt per capita (DOD constant 2000 US$) | 333.9 | 253.7 |
| ■ Debt service total (% of exports) | 13.4% | 5.8% |
| Aid per capita (constant 2000 US$) | 61.1 | 42.8 |
| Aid (% of GNI) | 22.4% | 12.6% |
| 2005 HIPC initiative (decision point/completion point) | Country has reached completion point | |
| **International trade** | | |
| Trade (% of GDP) | 57.3% | 57.2% |
| Food exports (% of merchandise exports) | 23.2%(d) | 17.2% |
| Food imports (% of merchandise imports) | 19.9%(d) | 16.2%(b) |
| Manufactures exports (% of merchandise exports) | 2.1%(d) | 40.0%(b) |
| Manufactures imports (% of merchandise imports) | 62.5%(d) | 67.2% |
| Fuel exports (% of merchandise exports) | 0.0%(e) | 0.1% |
| Fuel imports (% of merchandise imports) | 15.6%(d) | 21.9%(b) |
| **Information and communication technology** | | |
| ■ Fixed line and mobile phone subscribers (per 1,000) | 1.9 | 10.3 |
| Television sets (per 1,000) | 15.3 | 27.3 |
| 2002 Total number of permanent post offices (per 100,000) | 1.0 | |
| 1998 Daily newspapers (per 1,000) | 1.1 | |
| **Poverty and inequality** | | |
| 1994 National Gini index | 50.5 | |
| ■ 1994 Living on less than $1 a day (PPP) (% of population) | 72.3% | |
| ■ 1994 Living on less than $2 a day (PPP) (% of population) | 90.6% | |
| 1998 Poverty rate at national poverty line (% of population) | 63.8% | |
| 1998 Poverty rate at rural poverty line (% of rural population) | 75.9% | |
| 1998 Poverty rate at urban poverty line (% of urban population) | 30.1% | |
| 2003 HPI-1 rank – income poverty rank | -2 | |
| 2003 HDI rank – GDI rank | 1 | |
| **GOVERNANCE** | | |
| **Parliamentary development** | | |
| Lower or single house | Assemblée Nationale | |
| Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Lower or single house | 7/14/02 | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Parliamentary term in lower or single house (years) | 5 | |
| Parliamentarian obligation to declare personal assets | No | |
| **Participation** | | |
| 1997 Ratio of voters to registered voters (parliamentary) | 21.6% | |
| 1997 Ratio of voters to registered voters (presidential) | 28.4% | |
| Year women received right to vote | 1956 | |
| Year women received right to stand for election | 1956 | |
| Parliamentary bodies dealing with human rights | .. | |
| **Aggregate indicators** | | |
| World Bank governance indicators | 1996 | 2004 |
| Voice and accountability | 0.3 | 0.3 |
| Political stability | 0.6 | 0.1 |
| Government effectiveness | -0.8 | -0.3 |
| Regulatory quality | 0.2 | -0.3 |
| Rule of law | -0.8 | -0.3 |
| Control of corruption | -0.3 | -0.5 |
| **ENVIRONMENT** | **1990-1995** | **2000-2004** |
| ■ Proportion of land area covered by forest (%) | 11.6% | 10.8% |
| ■ Ratio of protected area to surface area | 2% | 2% |
| ■ Carbon dioxide emissions (metric tons per capita) | 0.0 | 0.0 |

Notes: (a) 1994; (b) 2001; (c) 1990; (d) 1996; (e) 1997.

# Mauritania

■ = MDG

## COUNTRY OVERVIEW

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2004 | Population (In millions) | 2.9 | |
| 2004 | Population density (per sq km) | 2.8 | |
| 2004 | Urban population (% of total population) | 63.0% | |
| ■ 2001 | Slum population as percentage of urban population | 94% | |
| 2004 | Population female (% of total) | 50.6% | |
| 2004 | Age dependency ratio (dependents to working-age population) | | 0.82 |
| Indebtedness | | Moderately indebted | |
| Independence date | | 1960 | |

| Committee for Development Policy LDC criteria | Inclusion | Graduation |
|---|---|---|
| Gap to threshold in % of current GNI per capita (US$) | -98.9% | -138.7% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current HAI score | -44.0% | -59.7% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current EVI score | -4.9% | -15.2% |

| MDGs progress | 1990-2000 |
|---|---|
| ■ MDG Hunger | Low progress |
| ■ MDG Primary education | .. |
| ■ MDG Gender equality in education | Achievable by 2015 |
| ■ MDG Child mortality | Reversal/stagnation |
| ■ MDG Access to water | Reversal/stagnation |

## WELL-BEING

| Health | 1990 | 2003 |
|---|---|---|
| Life expectancy at birth (years, male and female combined) | 49.1 | 51.0 |
| Fertility rate (births per woman) | 6.0 | 4.6 |
| ■ Under five mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) | 162 | 107 |
| | 1993-1998 | 1999-2004 |
| Physicians (per 1,000) | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| ■ Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total) | 40.0% | 56.9% |

| Education | 2000-2004 | |
|---|---|---|
| Legal guarantee of primary free education | Free education guaranteed | |
| Adult literacy (% of people ages 15 and above) | 51.2% | |
| Youth literacy (% age 15-24) | 61.3% | |
| Ratio of literate females to literate males (ages 15 and above) | 72.9% | |
| Ratio of literate females to males (ages 15-24) | 81.9% | |
| | 1999/2000 | 2002/2003 |
| ■ School enrolment primary (% gross) | 87% | 88% |
| Pupil-teacher ratio primary | 45% | 41% |
| School enrolment secondary (% gross) | 19% | 23% |

| Public responsibility | 1999 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| Public expenditure on health (% of GDP) | 1.7% | 2.9% |
| General government expenditure on health (% of total government expenditure) | 7.0% | 10.1% |
| Out-of-pocket expenditure on health (% of total health expenditure) | 35.8% | 25.8% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of GDP) | 3.6% | 4.1% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of government expenditure) | 16.6%(a) | .. |
| Military expenditure (% of GDP) | 2.0% | 1.6% |
| Military expenditure (% of government final consumption) | 13.2% | 10.9%(b) |
| Prison data and justice | 1990-1995 | 1996-2005 |
| Prison population rates (per 100,000) | .. | 41 |
| 2003 Pre-trial detainees (% of prison population) | 12.5% | |

## ECONOMY

| Economic overview | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| HDI | 0.424 | 0.477 |
| GDP per capita (constant international US$ at PPP) | 1684.2 | 2074.0 |
| Gross domestic savings (% of GDP) | 8.9% | 1.6% |
| Gross fixed capital formation (% of GDP) | 19.3% | 16.7% |
| Net foreign direct investment inflows (as % of GDP) | 0.7% | 18.1% |
| Inflation consumer prices (annual %) | 6.5% | 5.2% |

| Economic overview (continued) | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| General government final consumption expenditure (% of GDP) | 14.1% | 18.4% |
| Agricultural labour force (% of total labour force) | 55%(c) | 52% |
| Military personnel (% of total labour force) | 2.0% | 1.7% |
| **Debt and aid** | | |
| External debt per capita (DOD constant 2000 US$) | 1131.1 | 782.7 |
| ■ Debt service total (% of exports) | 22.9% | 27.7%(d) |
| Aid per capita (constant 2000 US$) | 108.8 | 80.5 |
| Aid (% of GNI) | 22.7% | 20.9% |
| 2005 HIPC initiative (decision point/completion point) | Country has reached completion point | |
| **International trade** | | |
| Trade (% of GDP) | 108.6% | 127.1% |
| Food exports (% of merchandise exports) | 57.4% | 8.0% |
| Food imports (% of merchandise imports) | 23.6% | .. |
| Manufactures exports (% of merchandise exports) | 0.2% | 20.8% |
| Manufactures imports (% of merchandise imports) | 53.3% | 43.5% |
| Fuel exports (% of merchandise exports) | 0.5% | 1.1% |
| Fuel imports (% of merchandise imports) | 22.0% | 29.2% |
| **Information and communication technology** | | |
| ■ Fixed line and mobile phone subscribers (per 1,000) | 4.1 | 141.4 |
| Television sets (per 1,000) | 34.4 | 43.6 |
| 2004 Total number of permanent post offices (per 100,000) | 0.9 | |
| Daily newspapers (per 1,000) | .. | |
| **Poverty and inequality** | | |
| 2000 National Gini index | 39.0 | |
| ■ 2000 Living on less than $1 a day (PPP) (% of population) | 25.9% | |
| ■ 2000 Living on less than $2 a day (PPP) (% of population) | 63.1% | |
| 2000 Poverty rate at national poverty line (% of population) | 46.3% | |
| 2000 Poverty rate at rural poverty line (% of rural population) | 61.2% | |
| 2000 Poverty rate at urban poverty line (% of urban population) | 25.4% | |
| 2003 HPI-1 rank – income poverty rank | 9 | |
| 2003 HDI rank – GDI rank | 0 | |
| **GOVERNANCE** | | |
| **Parliamentary development** | | |
| Lower or single house | .. | |
| Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Lower or single house | .. | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Parliamentary term in lower or single house (years) | .. | |
| Parliamentarian obligation to declare personal assets | .. | |
| **Participation** | | |
| 2001 Ratio of voters to registered voters (parliamentary) | 54.4% | |
| 1997 Ratio of voters to registered voters (presidential) | 74.7% | |
| Year women received right to vote | 1961 | |
| Year women received right to stand for election | 1961 | |
| Parliamentary bodies dealing with human rights | .. | |
| **Aggregate indicators** | | |
| World Bank governance indicators | 1996 | 2004 |
| Voice and accountability | -0.8 | -1.2 |
| Political stability | 0.7 | 0.3 |
| Government effectiveness | 0.3 | 0.2 |
| Regulatory quality | -0.6 | 0.0 |
| Rule of law | -0.6 | -0.6 |
| Control of corruption | -0.3(d) | 0.0 |
| **ENVIRONMENT** | **1990-1995** | **2000-2004** |
| ■ Proportion of land area covered by forest (%) | 0.4% | 0.3% |
| ■ Ratio of protected area to surface area | 2% | 2% |
| ■ Carbon dioxide emissions (metric tons per capita) | 1.3 | 1.1 |

Notes: (a) 1998/1999; (b) 2000; (c) 1990; (d) 1998.

# Mozambique

■ = MDG

## COUNTRY OVERVIEW

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2004 | Population (In millions) | 19.1 | |
| 2004 | Population density (per sq km) | 24.4 | |
| 2004 | Urban population (% of total population) | 36.8% | |
| ■ 2001 | Slum population as percentage of urban population | 94% | |
| 2004 | Population female (% of total) | 51.2% | |
| 2004 | Age dependency ratio (dependents to working-age population) | | 0.84 |
| Indebtedness | | Less indebted | |
| Independence date | | 1975 | |

| Committee for Development Policy LDC criteria | Inclusion | Graduation |
|---|---|---|
| Gap to threshold in % of current GNI per capita (US$) | -240.9% | -309.1% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current HAI score | -175.0% | -205.0% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current EVI score | 3.9% | -7.3% |

| MDGs progress | 1990-2000 |
|---|---|
| ■ MDG Hunger | Achievable by 2015 |
| ■ MDG Primary education | Low progress |
| ■ MDG Gender equality in education | Low progress |
| ■ MDG Child mortality | Low progress |
| ■ MDG Access to water | .. |

## WELL-BEING

| Health | 1990 | 2003 |
|---|---|---|
| Life expectancy at birth (years, male and female combined) | 43.4 | 40.7 |
| Fertility rate (births per woman) | 6.3 | 5.0 |
| ■ Under five mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) | 242 | 147 |
| | 1993-1998 | 1999-2004 |
| Physicians (per 1,000) | 0.0(a) | 0.0 |
| ■ Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total) | 44.2% | 48.0% |

| Education | 2000-2004 | |
|---|---|---|
| Legal guarantee of primary free education | No legal guarantee | |
| Adult literacy (% of people ages 15 and above) | 46.5% | |
| Youth literacy (% age 15-24) | 62.8% | |
| Ratio of literate females to literate males (ages 15 and above) | 50.4% | |
| Ratio of literate females to males (ages 15-24) | 64.3% | |
| | 1999/2000 | 2002/2003 |
| ■ School enrolment primary (% gross) | 85% | 103% |
| Pupil-teacher ratio primary | 61% | 67% |
| School enrolment secondary (% gross) | 11% | 16% |

| Public responsibility | 1999 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| Public expenditure on health (% of GDP) | 2.8% | 4.1% |
| General government expenditure on health (% of total government expenditure) | 14.2% | 19.9% |
| Out-of-pocket expenditure on health (% of total health expenditure) | 14.4% | 10.6% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of GDP) | 2.4% | .. |
| Public expenditure on education (% of government expenditure) | 12.3%(b) | .. |
| Military expenditure (% of GDP) | 1.4% | 1.3% |
| Military expenditure (% of government final consumption) | 14.7% | 11.2% |
| Prison data and justice | 1990-1995 | 1996-2005 |
| Prison population rates (per 100,000) | .. | 50 |
| 1999 Pre-trial detainees (% of prison population) | 72.9% | |

## ECONOMY

| Economic overview | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| HDI | 0.328 | 0.379 |
| GDP per capita (constant international US$ at PPP) | 684.1 | 1140.9 |
| Gross domestic savings (% of GDP) | 4.9% | 11.3% |
| Gross fixed capital formation (% of GDP) | 29.6% | 22.2% |
| Net foreign direct investment inflows (as % of GDP) | 1.9% | 7.8% |
| Inflation consumer prices (annual %) | 54.4% | 11.1% |

| Economic overview (continued) | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| General government final consumption expenditure (% of GDP) | 9.5% | 11.2% |
| Agricultural labour force (% of total labour force) | 83%(c) | 81% |
| Military personnel (% of total labour force) | 0.1% | 0.1% |
| **Debt and aid** | | |
| External debt per capita (DOD constant 2000 US$) | 511.9 | 247.8 |
| ■ Debt service total (% of exports) | 34.5% | 6.9% |
| Aid per capita (constant 2000 US$) | 73.0 | 51.9 |
| Aid (% of GNI) | 49.9% | 25.0% |
| 2005 HIPC initiative (decision point/completion point) | Country has reached completion point | |
| **International trade** | | |
| Trade (% of GDP) | 55.1% | 62.1% |
| Food exports (% of merchandise exports) | 66.3% | 22.9% |
| Food imports (% of merchandise imports) | 22.3% | 14.0%(d) |
| Manufactures exports (% of merchandise exports) | 13.3% | 7.5%(d) |
| Manufactures imports (% of merchandise imports) | 62.2% | 46.6%(d) |
| Fuel exports (% of merchandise exports) | 2.1% | 9.5%(d) |
| Fuel imports (% of merchandise imports) | 9.9% | 15.9%(d) |
| **Information and communication technology** | | |
| ■ Fixed line and mobile phone subscribers (per 1,000) | 4.0 | 18.6 |
| Television sets (per 1,000) | 4.0 | 16.5 |
| 2004 Total number of permanent post offices (per 100,000) | 1.6 | |
| 1998 Daily newspapers (per 1,000) | 2.5 | |
| **Poverty and inequality** | | |
| 1997 National Gini index | 39.6 | |
| ■ 1996 Living on less than $1 a day (PPP) (% of population) | 37.9% | |
| ■ 1996 Living on less than $2 a day (PPP) (% of population) | 78.4% | |
| 1997 Poverty rate at national poverty line (% of population) | 69.4% | |
| 1997 Poverty rate at rural poverty line (% of rural population) | 71.3% | |
| 1997 Poverty rate at urban poverty line (% of urban population) | 62.0% | |
| 2003 HPI-1 rank – income poverty rank | 10 | |
| 2003 HDI rank – GDI rank | -1 | |
| **GOVERNANCE** | | |
| **Parliamentary development** | | |
| Lower or single house | Assembleia da Republica | |
| Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Lower or single house | 12/1/04 | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Parliamentary term in lower or single house (years) | 5 | |
| Parliamentarian obligation to declare personal assets | No | |
| **Participation** | | |
| 1999 Ratio of voters to registered voters (parliamentary) | 68.1% | |
| 1999 Ratio of voters to registered voters (presidential) | 69.5% | |
| Year women received right to vote | 1975 | |
| Year women received right to stand for election | 1975 | |
| Parliamentary bodies dealing with human rights | .. | |
| **Aggregate indicators** | | |
| World Bank governance indicators | 1996 | 2004 |
| Voice and accountability | -0.2 | -0.1 |
| Political stability | -0.3 | -0.2 |
| Government effectiveness | -0.7 | -0.4 |
| Regulatory quality | -1.0 | -0.3 |
| Rule of law | -1.2 | -0.6 |
| Control of corruption | -0.5 | -0.8 |
| **ENVIRONMENT** | **1990-1995** | **2000-2004** |
| ■ Proportion of land area covered by forest (%) | 39.8% | 39.0% |
| ■ Ratio of protected area to surface area | 8% | 9% |
| ■ Carbon dioxide emissions (metric tons per capita) | 0.1 | 0.1 |

Notes: (a) 2000; (b) 1998/1999; (c) 1990; (d) 2001.

# Myanmar

■ = MDG

## COUNTRY OVERVIEW

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2004 | Population (In millions) | 49.9 | |
| 2004 | Population density (per sq km) | 75.9 | |
| 2004 | Urban population (% of total population) | 30.0% | |
| ■ 2001 | Slum population as percentage of urban population | 26% | |
| 2004 | Population female (% of total) | 50.4% | |
| 2004 | Age dependency ratio (dependents to working-age population) | | 0.56 |
| Indebtedness | | Severely indebted | |
| Independence date | | 1948 | |

| Committee for Development Policy LDC criteria | Inclusion | Graduation |
|---|---|---|
| Gap to threshold in % of current GNI per capita (US$) | -166.0% | -219.1% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current HAI score | 8.3% | -1.7% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current EVI score | -18.5% | -27.3% |

| MDGs progress | 1990-2000 |
|---|---|
| ■ MDG Hunger | Achievable by 2015 |
| ■ MDG Primary education | .. |
| ■ MDG Gender equality in education | Achievable by 2015 |
| ■ MDG Child mortality | Low progress |
| ■ MDG Access to water | .. |

## WELL-BEING

| Health | 1990 | 2003 |
|---|---|---|
| Life expectancy at birth (years, male and female combined) | 54.7 | 57.3 |
| Fertility rate (births per woman) | 3.8 | 2.8 |
| ■ Under five mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) | 130 | 107 |
| | 1993-1998 | 1999-2004 |
| Physicians (per 1,000) | 0.3 | 0.3 |
| ■ Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total) | 56.4% | .. |

| Education | 2000-2004 | |
|---|---|---|
| Legal guarantee of primary free education | No legal guarantee | |
| Adult literacy (% of people ages 15 and above) | 89.7% | |
| Youth literacy (% age 15-24) | 94.4% | |
| Ratio of literate females to literate males (ages 15 and above) | 92.0% | |
| Education | 2004 | Ratio of literate |
| females to males (ages 15-24) | 97.5% | |
| | 1999/2000 | 2002/2003 |
| ■ School enrolment primary (% gross) | 91% | 92% |
| Pupil-teacher ratio primary | 33% | 33% |
| School enrolment secondary (% gross) | 38% | 39% |

| Public responsibility | 1999 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| Public expenditure on health (% of GDP) | 0.2% | 0.4% |
| General government expenditure on health (% of total government expenditure) | 0.8% | 2.3% |
| Out-of-pocket expenditure on health (% of total health expenditure) | 88.8% | 81.3% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of GDP) | 0.6% | 1.3%(a) |
| Public expenditure on education (% of government expenditure) | 8.7% | 18.1%(a) |
| Military expenditure (% of GDP) | 2.0% | 1.2% |
| Military expenditure (% of government final consumption) | .. | .. |
| Prison data and justice | 1990-1995 | 1996-2005 |
| Prison population rates (per 100,000) | .. | 120 |
| 2002 Pre-trial detainees (% of prison population) | 12.9% | |

## ECONOMY

| Economic overview | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| HDI | .. | 0.578 |
| GDP per capita (constant international US$ at PPP) | .. | .. |
| Gross domestic savings (% of GDP) | 13.5% | ..(b) |
| Gross fixed capital formation (% of GDP) | 13.7% | 12.0%(c) |
| Net foreign direct investment inflows (as % of GDP) | .. | .. |

| Economic overview (continued) | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| Inflation consumer prices (annual %) | 25.2% | 36.6% |
| General government final consumption expenditure (% of GDP) | .. | .. |
| Agricultural labour force (% of total labour force) | 73%(d) | 70% |
| Military personnel (% of total labour force) | 1.6% | 2.2% |
| **Debt and aid** | | |
| External debt per capita (DOD constant 2000 US$) | 142.1 | 140.1 |
| ■ Debt service total (% of exports) | 17.8% | 4.2% |
| Aid per capita (constant 2000 US$) | 3.7 | 2.4 |
| Aid (% of GNI) | .. | .. |
| 2005 HIPC initiative (decision point/completion point) | Country still to be considered | |
| **International trade** | | |
| Trade (% of GDP) | 3.1% | 1.5%(e) |
| Food exports (% of merchandise exports) | 53.4%(f) | .. |
| Food imports (% of merchandise imports) | 14.7%(f) | .. |
| Manufactures exports (% of merchandise exports) | 9.4%(f) | .. |
| Manufactures imports (% of merchandise imports) | 82.1%(f) | .. |
| Fuel exports (% of merchandise exports) | 0.3%(f) | .. |
| Fuel imports (% of merchandise imports) | 2.3%(f) | .. |
| **Information and communication technology** | | |
| ■ Fixed line and mobile phone subscribers (per 1,000) | 3.6 | 8.1 |
| Television sets (per 1,000) | 6.9 | 7.0 |
| 2004 Total number of permanent post offices (per 100,000) | 2.7 | |
| 1998 Daily newspapers (per 1,000) | 8.7 | |
| **Poverty and inequality** | | |
| National Gini index | .. | |
| ■ Living on less than $1 a day (PPP) (% of population) | .. | |
| ■ Living on less than $2 a day (PPP) (% of population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at national poverty line (% of population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at rural poverty line (% of rural population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at urban poverty line (% of urban population) | .. | |
| HPI-1 rank – income poverty rank | .. | |
| HDI rank – GDI rank | .. | |
| **GOVERNANCE** | | |
| **Parliamentary development** | | |
| Lower or single house | .. | |
| Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Lower or single house | .. | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Parliamentary term in lower or single house (years) | .. | |
| Parliamentarian obligation to declare personal assets | .. | |
| **Participation** | | |
| 1990 Ratio of voters to registered voters (parliamentary) | 73.3% | |
| Ratio of voters to registered voters (presidential) | .. | |
| Year women received right to vote | 1935 | |
| Year women received right to stand for election | 1946 | |
| Parliamentary bodies dealing with human rights | .. | |
| Aggregate indicators | | |
| World Bank governance indicators | 1996 | 2004 |
| Voice and accountability | -1.7 | -2.2 |
| Political stability | -1.1 | -1.2 |
| Government effectiveness | -1.0 | -1.6 |
| Regulatory quality | -1.1 | -2.3 |
| Rule of law | -1.3 | -1.6 |
| Control of corruption | -1.2 | -1.5 |
| **ENVIRONMENT** | **1990-1995** | **2000-2004** |
| ■ Proportion of land area covered by forest (%) | 60.2% | 52.3% |
| ■ Ratio of protected area to surface area | 5% | 5% |
| ■ Carbon dioxide emissions (metric tons per capita) | 0.2 | 0.2 |

Notes: (a) 2000/2001; (b) 2000; (c) 1997; (d) 1990; (e) 1998; (f) 1992.

# Nepal

■ = MDG

## COUNTRY OVERVIEW

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2004 | Population (In millions) | 25.2 | |
| 2004 | Population density (per sq km) | 176.2 | |
| 2004 | Urban population (% of total population) | 15.4% | |
| ■ 2001 | Slum population as percentage of urban population | 92% | |
| 2004 | Population female (% of total) | 48.7% | |
| 2004 | Age dependency ratio (dependents to working-age population) | | 0.77 |
| Indebtedness | | Moderately indebted | |
| Independence date | | 1923 | |

| Committee for Development Policy LDC criteria | Inclusion | Graduation |
|---|---|---|
| Gap to threshold in % of current GNI per capita (US$) | -212.5% | -275.0% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current HAI score | -16.8% | -29.5% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current EVI score | 25.4% | 11.9% |

| MDGs progress | 1990-2000 |
|---|---|
| ■ MDG Hunger | Reversal/stagnation |
| ■ MDG Primary education | .. |
| ■ MDG Gender equality in education | Achievable by 2015 |
| ■ MDG Child mortality | Achievable by 2015 |
| ■ MDG Access to water | Achieved |

## WELL-BEING

| Health | 1990 | 2003 |
|---|---|---|
| Life expectancy at birth (years, male and female combined) | 53.6 | 60.2 |
| Fertility rate (births per woman) | 5.3 | 4.1 |
| ■ Under five mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) | 145 | 82 |
| | 1993-1998 | 1999-2004 |
| Physicians (per 1,000) | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| ■ Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total) | 9.0% | 10.9% |

| Education | 2000-2004 | |
|---|---|---|
| Legal guarantee of primary free education | Free education guaranteed | |
| Adult literacy (% of people ages 15 and above) | 48.6% | |
| Youth literacy (% age 15-24) | 70.1% | |
| Ratio of literate females to literate males (ages 15 and above) | 55.6% | |
| Ratio of literate females to males (ages 15-24) | 74.6% | |
| | 1999/2000 | 2002/2003 |
| ■ School enrolment primary (% gross) | 116% | 119% |
| Pupil-teacher ratio primary | 40% | 36% |
| School enrolment secondary (% gross) | 37% | 45% |

| Public responsibility | 1999 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| Public expenditure on health (% of GDP) | 1.0% | 1.4% |
| General government expenditure on health (% of total government expenditure) | 5.9% | 7.5% |
| Out-of-pocket expenditure on health (% of total health expenditure) | 72.7% | 67.1% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of GDP) | 3.0% | 3.4% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of government expenditure) | 13.2% | 14.9% |
| Military expenditure (% of GDP) | 0.9% | 1.6% |
| Military expenditure (% of government final consumption) | .. | .. |
| Prison data and justice | 1990-1995 | 1996-2005 |
| Prison population rates (per 100,000) | 29 | 29 |
| 2002 Pre-trial detainees (% of prison population) | 59.8% | |

## ECONOMY

| Economic overview | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| HDI | 0.466 | 0.526 |
| GDP per capita (constant international US$ at PPP) | 1179.8 | 1374.6 |
| Gross domestic savings (% of GDP) | 15.7% | 12.9% |
| Gross fixed capital formation (% of GDP) | 22.1% | 19.1% |
| Net foreign direct investment inflows (as % of GDP) | 0.0% | 0.3% |
| Inflation consumer prices (annual %) | 7.6% | 2.8% |

| Economic overview (continued) | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| General government final consumption expenditure (% of GDP) | 9.2% | 10.3% |
| Agricultural labour force (% of total labour force) | 94%(a) | 93% |
| Military personnel (% of total labour force) | 0.6% | 0.9% |
| **Debt and aid** | | |
| External debt per capita (DOD constant 2000 US$) | 128.4 | 124.6 |
| ■ Debt service total (% of exports) | 7.5% | 6.0% |
| Aid per capita (constant 2000 US$) | 23.0 | 17.9 |
| Aid (% of GNI) | 9.8% | 8.0% |
| 2005 HIPC initiative (decision point/completion point) | .. | |
| **International trade** | | |
| Trade (% of GDP) | 59.5% | 47.7% |
| Food exports (% of merchandise exports) | 1.1% | 9.9% |
| Food imports (% of merchandise imports) | 15.1% | 12.6%(b) |
| Manufactures exports (% of merchandise exports) | 98.8% | 66.7%(b) |
| Manufactures imports (% of merchandise imports) | 47.4% | 49.1%(b) |
| Fuel exports (% of merchandise exports) | 0.0%(c) | 0.0%(d) |
| Fuel imports (% of merchandise imports) | 19.5% | 16.3%(b) |
| **Information and communication technology** | | |
| ■ Fixed line and mobile phone subscribers (per 1,000) | 4.1 | 17.8 |
| Television sets (per 1,000) | 3.4 | 8.5(e) |
| 2000 Total number of permanent post offices (per 100,000) | 17.4 | |
| Daily newspapers (per 1,000) | .. | |
| **Poverty and inequality** | | |
| 1996 National Gini index | 36.7 | |
| ■ 1995 Living on less than $1 a day (PPP) (% of population) | 39.1% | |
| ■ 1995 Living on less than $2 a day (PPP) (% of population) | 80.9% | |
| 1996 Poverty rate at national poverty line (% of population) | 42.0% | |
| 1996 Poverty rate at rural poverty line (% of rural population) | 44.0% | |
| 1996 Poverty rate at urban poverty line (% of urban population) | 23.0% | |
| 2003 HPI-1 rank – income poverty rank | -5 | |
| 2003 HDI rank – GDI rank | -2 | |
| **GOVERNANCE** | | |
| **Parliamentary development** | | |
| Lower or single house | Pratinidhi Sabha | |
| Upper house or senate | Rastriya Sabha | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Lower or single house | 5/3/99 | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Upper house or senate | 6/27/01 | |
| Parliamentary term in lower or single house (years) | 5 | |
| Parliamentarian obligation to declare personal assets | No | |
| **Participation** | | |
| 1999 Ratio of voters to registered voters (parliamentary) | 65.8% | |
| Ratio of voters to registered voters (presidential) | .. | |
| Year women received right to vote | 1951 | |
| Year women received right to stand for election | 1951 | |
| 1998 Parliamentary bodies dealing with human rights | Social Justice Committee | |
| **Aggregate indicators** | | |
| World Bank governance indicators | 1996 | 2004 |
| Voice and accountability | 0.1 | -1.0 |
| Political stability | -0.3 | -1.7 |
| Government effectiveness | -0.4 | -0.9 |
| Regulatory quality | -0.2 | -0.6 |
| Rule of law | -0.4 | -0.8 |
| Control of corruption | -0.3 | -0.6 |
| **ENVIRONMENT** | **1990-1995** | **2000-2004** |
| ■ Proportion of land area covered by forest (%) | 32.7% | 27.3% |
| ■ Ratio of protected area to surface area | 14% | 17% |
| ■ Carbon dioxide emissions (metric tons per capita) | 0.1 | 0.2 |

Notes: (a) 1990; (b) 2000; (c) 1994; (d) 1999; (e) 2001.

# Niger

■ = MDG

## COUNTRY OVERVIEW

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2004 | Population (In millions) | 12.1 | |
| 2004 | Population density (per sq km) | 9.5 | |
| 2004 | Urban population (% of total population) | 22.7% | |
| ■ 2001 | Slum population as percentage of urban population | 96% | |
| 2004 | Population female (% of total) | 49.7% | |
| 2004 | Age dependency ratio (dependents to working-age population) | | 1.04 |
| Indebtedness | | Moderately indebted | |
| Independence date | | 1960 | |

| Committee for Development Policy LDC criteria | Inclusion | Graduation |
|---|---|---|
| Gap to threshold in % of current GNI per capita (US$) | -316.7% | -400.0% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current HAI score | -287.3% | -329.6% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current EVI score | -31.6% | -39.0% |

| MDGs progress | 1990-2000 |
|---|---|
| ■ MDG Hunger | Low progress |
| ■ MDG Primary education | Low progress |
| ■ MDG Gender equality in education | Low progress |
| ■ MDG Child mortality | Low progress |
| ■ MDG Access to water | Low progress |

## WELL-BEING

| Health | 1990 | 2003 |
|---|---|---|
| Life expectancy at birth (years, male and female combined) | 42.1 | 46.4 |
| Fertility rate (births per woman) | 7.6 | 7.1 |
| ■ Under five mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) | 320 | 262 |
| | 1993-1998 | 1999-2004 |
| Physicians (per 1,000) | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| ■ Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total) | 14.9% | 15.7% |

| Education | 2000-2004 | |
|---|---|---|
| Legal guarantee of primary free education | Free education guaranteed | |
| Adult literacy (% of people ages 15 and above) | 14.4% | |
| Youth literacy (% age 15-24) | 19.8% | |
| Ratio of literate females to literate males (ages 15 and above) | 47.9% | |
| Ratio of literate females to males (ages 15-24) | 54.3% | |
| | 1999/2000 | 2002/2003 |
| ■ School enrolment primary (% gross) | 33% | 44% |
| Pupil-teacher ratio primary | 41% | 42% |
| School enrolment secondary (% gross) | 7% | 7% |

| Public responsibility | 1999 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| Public expenditure on health (% of GDP) | 2.3% | 2.0% |
| General government expenditure on health (% of total government expenditure) | 12.5% | 10.0% |
| Out-of-pocket expenditure on health (% of total health expenditure) | 45.1% | 46.5% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of GDP) | 2.1% | 2.3% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of government expenditure) | .. | .. |
| Military expenditure (% of GDP) | 1.2% | 1.1% |
| Military expenditure (% of government final consumption) | .. | .. |
| Prison data and justice | 1990-1995 | 1996-2005 |
| Prison population rates (per 100,000) | .. | 52 |
| Pre-trial detainees (% of prison population) | .. | |

## ECONOMY

| Economic overview | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| HDI | 0.256 | 0.281 |
| GDP per capita (constant international US$ at PPP) | 787.1 | 775.0 |
| Gross domestic savings (% of GDP) | 0.2% | 7.6% |
| Gross fixed capital formation (% of GDP) | 7.0% | 15.7% |
| Net foreign direct investment inflows (as % of GDP) | 0.4% | 1.1% |
| Inflation consumer prices (annual %) | 10.6% | 0.3% |

| Economic overview (continued) | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| General government final consumption expenditure (% of GDP) | 14.1% | 12.4% |
| Agricultural labour force (% of total labour force) | 90%(a) | 87% |
| Military personnel (% of total labour force) | 0.3% | 0.2% |
| **Debt and aid** | | |
| External debt per capita (DOD constant 2000 US$) | 188.8 | 170.0 |
| ■ Debt service total (% of exports) | 16.7% | .. |
| Aid per capita (constant 2000 US$) | 33.0 | 36.4 |
| Aid (% of GNI) | 15.0% | 16.7% |
| 2005 HIPC initiative (decision point/completion point) | Country has reached completion point | |
| **International trade** | | |
| Trade (% of GDP) | 41.5% | 40.6% |
| Food exports (% of merchandise exports) | 17.4% | 30.4% |
| Food imports (% of merchandise imports) | 32.4% | 33.5% |
| Manufactures exports (% of merchandise exports) | 0.9% | 7.9% |
| Manufactures imports (% of merchandise imports) | 50.8% | 44.0% |
| Fuel exports (% of merchandise exports) | 0.0% | 1.6% |
| Fuel imports (% of merchandise imports) | 12.9% | 16.9% |
| **Information and communication technology** | | |
| ■ Fixed line and mobile phone subscribers (per 1,000) | 1.5 | 3.3 |
| Television sets (per 1,000) | 8.6 | 10.2 |
| 2004 Total number of permanent post offices (per 100,000) | 0.4 | |
| 1998 Daily newspapers (per 1,000) | 0.2 | |
| **Poverty and inequality** | | |
| 1995 National Gini index | 50.5 | |
| ■ 1995 Living on less than $1 a day (PPP) (% of population) | 60.6% | |
| ■ 1995 Living on less than $2 a day (PPP) (% of population) | 85.8% | |
| 1993 Poverty rate at national poverty line (% of population) | 63.0% | |
| 1993 Poverty rate at rural poverty line (% of rural population) | 66.0% | |
| 1993 Poverty rate at urban poverty line (% of urban population) | 52.0% | |
| 2003 HPI-1 rank – income poverty rank | 4 | |
| 2003 HDI rank – GDI rank | 0 | |
| **GOVERNANCE** | | |
| **Parliamentary development** | | |
| Lower or single house | Assemblée Nationale | |
| Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Lower or single house | 12/4/04 | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Parliamentary term in lower or single house (years) | 5 | |
| Parliamentarian obligation to declare personal assets | No | |
| **Participation** | | |
| 1999 Ratio of voters to registered voters (parliamentary) | 99.4% | |
| 1999 Ratio of voters to registered voters (presidential) | 39.6% | |
| Year women received right to vote | 1948 | |
| Year women received right to stand for election | 1948 | |
| Parliamentary bodies dealing with human rights | .. | |
| **Aggregate indicators** | | |
| World Bank governance indicators | 1996 | 2004 |
| Voice and accountability | -0.4 | -0.1 |
| Political stability | -0.1 | -0.6 |
| Government effectiveness | -0.8 | -0.9 |
| Regulatory quality | -0.8 | -0.6 |
| Rule of law | -1.3 | -0.9 |
| Control of corruption | -0.3 | -0.9 |
| **ENVIRONMENT** | **1990-1995** | **2000-2004** |
| ■ Proportion of land area covered by forest (%) | 1.5% | 1.0% |
| ■ Ratio of protected area to surface area | 7% | 7% |
| ■ Carbon dioxide emissions (metric tons per capita) | 0.1 | 0.1 |

Notes: (a) 1990.

# Rwanda

■ = MDG

## COUNTRY OVERVIEW

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2004 | Population (In millions) | 8.4 | |
| 2004 | Population density (per sq km) | 341.0 | |
| 2004 | Urban population (% of total population) | 20.1% | |
| ■ 2001 | Slum population as percentage of urban population | 88% | |
| 2004 | Population female (% of total) | 52.3% | |
| 2004 | Age dependency ratio (dependents to working-age population) | | 0.91 |
| Indebtedness | | Severely indebted | |
| Independence date | | 1960 | |

| Committee for Development Policy LDC criteria | Inclusion | Graduation |
|---|---|---|
| Gap to threshold in % of current GNI per capita (US$) | -226.1% | -291.3% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current HAI score | -61.3% | -78.9% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current EVI score | -41.5% | -47.9% |

| MDGs progress | 1990-2000 |
|---|---|
| ■ MDG Hunger | Reversal/stagnation |
| ■ MDG Primary education | Achievable by 2015 |
| ■ MDG Gender equality in education | Achieved |
| ■ MDG Child mortality | Reversal/stagnation |
| ■ MDG Access to water | .. |

## WELL-BEING

| Health | 1990 | 2003 |
|---|---|---|
| Life expectancy at birth (years, male and female combined) | 40.2 | 39.8 |
| Fertility rate (births per woman) | 7.1 | 5.7 |
| ■ Under five mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) | 173 | 203 |
| | 1993-1998 | 1999-2004 |
| Physicians (per 1,000) | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| ■ Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total) | 25.8% | 31.3% |

| Education | 2000-2004 | |
|---|---|---|
| Legal guarantee of primary free education | Free education guaranteed | |
| Adult literacy (% of people ages 15 and above) | 64.0% | |
| Youth literacy (% age 15-24) | 76.5% | |
| Ratio of literate females to literate males (ages 15 and above) | 83.5% | |
| Ratio of literate females to males (ages 15-24) | 98.4% | |
| | 1999/2000 | 2002/2003 |
| ■ School enrolment primary (% gross) | 121% | 122% |
| Pupil-teacher ratio primary | 54% | 60% |
| School enrolment secondary (% gross) | 12% | 16% |

| Public responsibility | 1999 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| Public expenditure on health (% of GDP) | 3.0% | 3.1% |
| General government expenditure on health (% of total government expenditure) | 13.5% | 13.4% |
| Out-of-pocket expenditure on health (% of total health expenditure) | 29.7% | 27.9% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of GDP) | 2.6%(a) | 2.8%(b) |
| Public expenditure on education (% of government expenditure) | .. | .. |
| Military expenditure (% of GDP) | 4.6% | 2.8% |
| Military expenditure (% of government final consumption) | 41.1% | 15.5% |
| Prison data and justice | 1990-1995 | 1996-2005 |
| Prison population rates (per 100,000) | .. | 129 |
| 2002 Pre-trial detainees (% of prison population) | 2.4% | |

## ECONOMY

| Economic overview | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| HDI | 0.335 | 0.45 |
| GDP per capita (constant international US$ at PPP) | 911.8 | 1227.2 |
| Gross domestic savings (% of GDP) | -7.3% | 1.1% |
| Gross fixed capital formation (% of GDP) | 13.4% | 20.8% |
| Net foreign direct investment inflows (as % of GDP) | 0.2% | 0.3% |
| Inflation consumer prices (annual %) | 7.4%(c) | 6.9% |

| Economic overview (continued) | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| General government final consumption expenditure (% of GDP) | 10.3% | 13.3% |
| Agricultural labour force (% of total labour force) | 92%(d) | 90% |
| Military personnel (% of total labour force) | 1.6% | 1.3% |
| **Debt and aid** | | |
| External debt per capita (DOD constant 2000 US$) | 196.5 | 173.3 |
| ■ Debt service total (% of exports) | 20.4% | 14.6% |
| Aid per capita (constant 2000 US$) | 133.8 | 37.3 |
| Aid (% of GNI) | 54.1% | 20.1% |
| 2005 HIPC initiative (decision point/completion point) | Country has reached decision point | |
| **International trade** | | |
| Trade (% of GDP) | 31.0% | 36.2% |
| Food exports (% of merchandise exports) | 57.3%(c) | 52.3% |
| Food imports (% of merchandise imports) | 18.9%(c) | 11.7% |
| Manufactures exports (% of merchandise exports) | 13.8%(c) | 10.3% |
| Manufactures imports (% of merchandise imports) | 64.1%(c) | 66.7% |
| Fuel exports (% of merchandise exports) | 0.2%(c) | 6.8% |
| Fuel imports (% of merchandise imports) | 11.5%(c) | 15.6% |
| **Information and communication technology** | | |
| ■ Fixed line and mobile phone subscribers (per 1,000) | 1.3 | 16.4 |
| Television sets (per 1,000) | 4.2 | 7.8 |
| 2004 Total number of permanent post offices (per 100,000) | 0.2 | |
| 1998 Daily newspapers (per 1,000) | 0.9 | |
| **Poverty and inequality** | | |
| 2001 National Gini index | .. | |
| ■ 2000 Living on less than $1 a day (PPP) (% of population) | 51.7% | |
| ■ 2000 Living on less than $2 a day (PPP) (% of population) | 83.7% | |
| 2000 Poverty rate at national poverty line (% of population) | 60.3% | |
| 2000 Poverty rate at rural poverty line (% of rural population) | 65.7% | |
| 2000 Poverty rate at urban poverty line (% of urban population) | 14.3% | |
| 2003 HPI-1 rank – income poverty rank | -13 | |
| 2003 HDI rank – GDI rank | 1 | |
| **GOVERNANCE** | | |
| **Parliamentary development** | | |
| Lower or single house | Chambre des Députés | |
| Upper house or senate | Sénat | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Lower or single house | 9/29/03 | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Upper house or senate | 10/2/03 | |
| Parliamentary term in lower or single house (years) | 5 | |
| Parliamentarian obligation to declare personal assets | No | |
| **Participation** | | |
| Ratio of voters to registered voters (parliamentary) | .. | |
| Ratio of voters to registered voters (presidential) | .. | |
| Year women received right to vote | 1961 | |
| Year women received right to stand for election | 1961 | |
| 1995 Parliamentary bodies dealing with human rights | Committee for National Unity and Human Rights | |
| **Aggregate indicators** | | |
| World Bank governance indicators | 1996 | 2004 |
| Voice and accountability | -1.4 | -1.1 |
| Political stability | -1.2 | -0.9 |
| Government effectiveness | -1.3 | -0.6 |
| Regulatory quality | -1.1 | -0.4 |
| Rule of law | -0.2 | -0.9 |
| Control of corruption | -0.5(e) | -0.4 |
| **ENVIRONMENT** | **1990-1995** | **2000-2004** |
| ■ Proportion of land area covered by forest (%) | 18.5% | 12.4% |
| ■ Ratio of protected area to surface area | 8% | 8% |
| ■ Carbon dioxide emissions (metric tons per capita) | 0.1 | 0.1 |

Notes: (a) 1998/1999; (b) 2000/2001; (c) 1996; (d) 1990; (e) 1998.

# Samoa

■ = MDG

## COUNTRY OVERVIEW

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2004 | Population (In millions) | 0.2 | |
| 2004 | Population density (per sq km) | 63.3 | |
| 2004 | Urban population (% of total population) | 22.4% | |
| ■ 2001 | Slum population as percentage of urban population | 10% | |
| 2004 | Population female (% of total) | 48.9% | |
| 2004 | Age dependency ratio (dependents to working-age population) | | 0.68 |
| Indebtedness | | Moderately indebted | |
| Independence date | | 1962 | |

| Committee for Development Policy LDC criteria | Inclusion | Graduation |
|---|---|---|
| Gap to threshold in % of current GNI per capita (US$) | 48.2% | 37.8% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current HAI score | 38.1% | 31.3% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current EVI score | -9.5% | -19.3% |

| MDGs progress | 1990-2000 |
|---|---|
| ■ MDG Hunger | .. |
| ■ MDG Primary education | Achieved |
| ■ MDG Gender equality in education | Achieved |
| ■ MDG Child mortality | Achievable by 2015 |
| ■ MDG Access to water | Achieved |

## WELL-BEING

| Health | 1990 | 2003 |
|---|---|---|
| Life expectancy at birth (years, male and female combined) | 66.3 | 69.5 |
| Fertility rate (births per woman) | 4.8 | 4.0 |
| ■ Under five mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) | 42 | 24 |
| | 1993-1998 | 1999-2004 |
| Physicians (per 1,000) | 0.3 | 0.7 |
| ■ Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total) | 76.0% | 100.0%(a) |

| Education | 2000-2004 | |
|---|---|---|
| Legal guarantee of primary free education | No legal guarantee | |
| Adult literacy (% of people ages 15 and above) | 98.7% | |
| Youth literacy (% age 15-24) | 99.5% | |
| Ratio of literate females to literate males (ages 15 and above) | 99.4% | |
| Ratio of literate females to males (ages 15-24) | 100.1% | |
| | 1999/2000 | 2002/2003 |
| ■ School enrolment primary (% gross) | 98% | 105% |
| Pupil-teacher ratio primary | 24% | 27% |
| School enrolment secondary (% gross) | 75% | 76% |

| Public responsibility | 1999 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| Public expenditure on health (% of GDP) | 4.6% | 4.7% |
| General government expenditure on health (% of total government expenditure) | 12.9% | 13.9% |
| Out-of-pocket expenditure on health (% of total health expenditure) | 20.7% | 19.2% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of GDP) | 4.0% | 4.8%(b) |
| Public expenditure on education (% of government expenditure) | 13.3% | 14.6%(b) |
| Military expenditure (% of GDP) | .. | .. |
| Military expenditure (% of government final consumption) | .. | .. |
| Prison data and justice | 1990-1995 | 1996-2005 |
| Prison population rates (per 100,000) | 150 | 123 |
| 2003 Pre-trial detainees (% of prison population) | 6.8% | |

## ECONOMY

| Economic overview | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| HDI | 0.742 | 0.776 |
| GDP per capita (constant international US$ at PPP) | 4420.6 | 5270.1 |
| Gross domestic savings (% of GDP) | .. | .. |
| Gross fixed capital formation (% of GDP) | .. | .. |
| Net foreign direct investment inflows (as % of GDP) | 1.7% | 0.0% |
| Inflation consumer prices (annual %) | -2.9% | 16.3% |

| Economic overview (continued) | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| General government final consumption expenditure (% of GDP) | .. | .. |
| Agricultural labour force (% of total labour force) | 42%(c) | 33% |
| Military personnel (% of total labour force) | .. | .. |
| **Debt and aid** | | |
| External debt per capita (DOD constant 2000 US$) | 1121.4 | 1938.2 |
| ■ Debt service total (% of exports) | 4.2% | 5.1% |
| Aid per capita (constant 2000 US$) | 285.4 | 175.4 |
| Aid (% of GNI) | 22.4% | 10.4% |
| 2005 HIPC initiative (decision point/completion point) | .. | |
| **International trade** | | |
| Trade (% of GDP) | 94.5% | 114.2%(d) |
| Food exports (% of merchandise exports) | 96.3%(e) | 17.3% |
| Food imports (% of merchandise imports) | 27.1%(c) | 27.5% |
| Manufactures exports (% of merchandise exports) | 3.6%(c) | 81.4% |
| Manufactures imports (% of merchandise imports) | 58.8%(c) | 56.5% |
| Fuel exports (% of merchandise exports) | .. | 0.5% |
| Fuel imports (% of merchandise imports) | 11.4%(c) | 13.5% |
| **Information and communication technology** | | |
| ■ Fixed line and mobile phone subscribers (per 1,000) | 46.4 | 130.5 |
| Television sets (per 1,000) | 130.9 | 148.2 |
| 2003 Total number of permanent post offices (per 100,000) | 20.2 | |
| Daily newspapers (per 1,000) | .. | |
| **Poverty and inequality** | | |
| National Gini index | .. | |
| ■ Living on less than $1 a day (PPP) (% of population) | .. | |
| ■ Living on less than $2 a day (PPP) (% of population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at national poverty line (% of population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at rural poverty line (% of rural population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at urban poverty line (% of urban population) | .. | |
| HPI-1 rank – income poverty rank | .. | |
| HDI rank – GDI rank | .. | |
| **GOVERNANCE** | | |
| **Parliamentary development** | | |
| Lower or single house | Fono | |
| Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Lower or single house | 3/5/01 | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Parliamentary term in lower or single house (years) | 5 | |
| Parliamentarian obligation to declare personal assets | No | |
| **Participation** | | |
| 2001 Ratio of voters to registered voters (parliamentary) | 82.5% | |
| Ratio of voters to registered voters (presidential) | .. | |
| Year women received right to vote | 1990 | |
| Year women received right to stand for election | 1990 | |
| Parliamentary bodies dealing with human rights | .. | |
| **Aggregate indicators** | | |
| World Bank governance indicators | 1996 | 2004 |
| Voice and accountability | 0.8 | 0.7 |
| Political stability | 0.8(f) | 0.9 |
| Government effectiveness | -0.3 | 0.1 |
| Regulatory quality | -0.2 | 0.4 |
| Rule of law | -1.0(a) | 0.6 |
| Control of corruption | -0.3(a) | 0.0 |
| **ENVIRONMENT** | **1990-1995** | **2000-2004** |
| ■ Proportion of land area covered by forest (%) | .. | 37.2% |
| ■ Ratio of protected area to surface area | 1% | 2% |
| ■ Carbon dioxide emissions (metric tons per capita) | 0.8 | 0.8 |

Notes: (a) 1998; (b) 2001/2002; (c) 1990; (d) 2000; (e) 1997; (f) 2002.

# São Tomé and Principe

■ = MDG

## COUNTRY OVERVIEW

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2004 | Population (In millions) | 0.2 | |
| 2004 | Population density (per sq km) | 167.3 | |
| 2004 | Urban population (% of total population) | 37.9% | |
| ■ 2001 | Slum population as percentage of urban population | 2% | |
| 2004 | Population female (% of total) | 50.2% | |
| 2004 | Age dependency ratio (dependents to working-age population) | | 0.81 |
| Indebtedness | | Severely indebted | |
| Independence date | | 1975 | |

| Committee for Development Policy LDC criteria | Inclusion | Graduation |
|---|---|---|
| Gap to threshold in % of current GNI per capita (US$) | -167.9% | -221.4% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current HAI score | 1.4% | -9.3% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current EVI score | -11.5% | -21.1% |

| MDGs progress | 1990-2000 |
|---|---|
| ■ MDG Hunger | .. |
| ■ MDG Primary education | .. |
| ■ MDG Gender equality in education | .. |
| ■ MDG Child mortality | Low progress |
| ■ MDG Access to water | .. |

## WELL-BEING

| Health | 1990 | 2003 |
|---|---|---|
| Life expectancy at birth (years, male and female combined) | 62.2 | 66.0 |
| Fertility rate (births per woman) | 5.1 | 4.3 |
| ■ Under five mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) | 118 | 118 |
| | 1993-1998 | 1999-2004 |
| Physicians (per 1,000) | 0.5 | 0.5 |
| ■ Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total) | .. | 78.6% |

| Education | 2000-2004 | |
|---|---|---|
| Legal guarantee of primary free education | Free education guaranteed | |
| Adult literacy (% of people ages 15 and above) | .. | |
| Youth literacy (% age 15-24) | .. | |
| Ratio of literate females to literate males (ages 15 and above) | .. | |
| Ratio of literate females to males (ages 15-24) | .. | |
| | 1999/2000 | 2002/2003 |
| ■ School enrolment primary (% gross) | 107%(a) | 126%(b) |
| Pupil-teacher ratio primary | 36%(a) | 33%(b) |
| School enrolment secondary (% gross) | .. | 39%(b) |

| Public responsibility | 1999 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| Public expenditure on health (% of GDP) | 8.7% | 9.7% |
| General government expenditure on health (% of total government expenditure) | 12.5% | 14.5% |
| Out-of-pocket expenditure on health (% of total health expenditure) | 12.7% | 12.3% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of GDP) | .. | .. |
| Public expenditure on education (% of government expenditure) | .. | .. |
| Military expenditure (% of GDP) | .. | .. |
| Military expenditure (% of government final consumption) | .. | .. |
| Prison data and justice | 1990-1995 | 1996-2005 |
| Prison population rates (per 100,000) | 99 | 79 |
| 2002 Pre-trial detainees (% of prison population) | 58.5% | |

## ECONOMY

| Economic overview | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| HDI | .. | 0.604 |
| GDP per capita (constant international US$ at PPP) | .. | .. |
| Gross domestic savings (% of GDP) | -11.4% | -17.9% |
| Gross fixed capital formation (% of GDP) | 68.1% | 33.1% |
| Net foreign direct investment inflows (as % of GDP) | 0.0% | 16.8% |
| Inflation consumer prices (annual %) | .. | .. |

| Economic overview (continued) | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| General government final consumption expenditure (% of GDP) | 27.6% | 24.8% |
| Agricultural labour force (% of total labour force) | 71%(c) | 63% |
| Military personnel (% of total labour force) | .. | .. |
| **Debt and aid** | | |
| External debt per capita (DOD constant 2000 US$) | 2013.8 | 2025.6 |
| ■ Debt service total (% of exports) | 34.0%(c) | 30.9% |
| Aid per capita (constant 2000 US$) | 693.1 | 226.1 |
| Aid (% of GNI) | 210.6% | 66.6% |
| 2005 HIPC initiative (decision point/completion point) | Country has reached decision point | |
| **International trade** | | |
| Trade (% of GDP) | 120.7% | 143.7% |
| Food exports (% of merchandise exports) | .. | .. |
| Food imports (% of merchandise imports) | .. | .. |
| Manufactures exports (% of merchandise exports) | .. | .. |
| Manufactures imports (% of merchandise imports) | .. | .. |
| Fuel exports (% of merchandise exports) | .. | .. |
| Fuel imports (% of merchandise imports) | .. | .. |
| **Information and communication technology** | | |
| ■ Fixed line and mobile phone subscribers (per 1,000) | 19.7 | 77.6 |
| Television sets (per 1,000) | 51.2 | 92.7 |
| 2004 Total number of permanent post offices (per 100,000) | 5.6 | |
| Daily newspapers (per 1,000) | .. | |
| **Poverty and inequality** | | |
| National Gini index | .. | |
| ■ Living on less than $1 a day (PPP) (% of population) | .. | |
| ■ Living on less than $2 a day (PPP) (% of population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at national poverty line (% of population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at rural poverty line (% of rural population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at urban poverty line (% of urban population) | .. | |
| HPI-1 rank – income poverty rank | .. | |
| HDI rank – GDI rank | .. | |
| **GOVERNANCE** | | |
| **Parliamentary development** | | |
| Lower or single house | Assembleia Nacional | |
| Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Lower or single house | 3/3/02 | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Parliamentary term in lower or single house (years) | 4 | |
| Parliamentarian obligation to declare personal assets | No | |
| **Participation** | | |
| 2002 Ratio of voters to registered voters (parliamentary) | 66.3% | |
| 2001 Ratio of voters to registered voters (presidential) | 70.6% | |
| Year women received right to vote | 1975 | |
| Year women received right to stand for election | 1975 | |
| 1991 Parliamentary bodies dealing with human rights | Third Committee | |
| **Aggregate indicators** | | |
| World Bank governance indicators | 1996 | 2004 |
| Voice and accountability | 0.9 | 0.6 |
| Political stability | 0.6(d) | 0.1 |
| Government effectiveness | -0.5 | -0.9 |
| Regulatory quality | -0.4 | -0.5 |
| Rule of law | -1.0(e) | -0.5 |
| Control of corruption | -0.8(e) | -0.7 |
| **ENVIRONMENT** | **1990-1995** | **2000-2004** |
| ■ Proportion of land area covered by forest (%) | 28.3% | 28.3% |
| ■ Ratio of protected area to surface area | .. | .. |
| ■ Carbon dioxide emissions (metric tons per capita) | 0.6 | 0.6 |

Notes: (a) 1998/1999; (b) 2001/2002; (c) 1990; (d) 2002; (e) 1998.

# Senegal

■ = MDG

## COUNTRY OVERVIEW

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2004 | Population (In millions) | 10.5 | |
| 2004 | Population density (per sq km) | 54.3 | |
| 2004 | Urban population (% of total population) | 50.3% | |
| ■ 2001 | Slum population as percentage of urban population | 76% | |
| 2004 | Population female (% of total) | 50.3% | |
| 2004 | Age dependency ratio (dependents to working-age population) | | 0.85 |
| Indebtedness | | Moderately indebted | |
| Independence date | | 1960 | |

| Committee for Development Policy LDC criteria | Inclusion | Graduation |
|---|---|---|
| Gap to threshold in % of current GNI per capita (US$) | -53.1% | -83.7% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current HAI score | -44.4% | -60.1% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current EVI score | -3.6% | -14.1% |

| MDGs progress | 1990-2000 |
|---|---|
| ■ MDG Hunger | Reversal/stagnation |
| ■ MDG Primary education | Low progress |
| ■ MDG Gender equality in education | Achievable by 2015 |
| ■ MDG Child mortality | Low progress |
| ■ MDG Access to water | Achievable by 2015 |

## WELL-BEING

| Health | 1990 | 2003 |
|---|---|---|
| Life expectancy at birth (years, male and female combined) | 49.5 | 52.3 |
| Fertility rate (births per woman) | 6.2 | 4.9 |
| ■ Under five mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) | 148 | 137 |
| | 1993-1998 | 1999-2004 |
| Physicians (per 1,000) | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| ■ Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total) | 46.6% | 41.4% |

| Education | 2000-2004 | |
|---|---|---|
| Legal guarantee of primary free education | Free education guaranteed | |
| Adult literacy (% of people ages 15 and above) | 39.3% | |
| Youth literacy (% age 15-24) | 49.1% | |
| Ratio of literate females to literate males (ages 15 and above) | 57.3% | |
| Ratio of literate females to males (ages 15-24) | 70.0% | |
| | 1999/2000 | 2002/2003 |
| ■ School enrolment primary (% gross) | 72% | 80% |
| Pupil-teacher ratio primary | 51% | 49% |
| School enrolment secondary (% gross) | 17% | 19% |

| Public responsibility | 1999 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| Public expenditure on health (% of GDP) | 1.7% | 2.3% |
| General government expenditure on health (% of total government expenditure) | 8.3% | 11.2% |
| Out-of-pocket expenditure on health (% of total health expenditure) | 60.6% | 52.9% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of GDP) | 3.4% | 3.6% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of government expenditure) | .. | .. |
| Military expenditure (% of GDP) | 1.7% | 1.5% |
| Military expenditure (% of government final consumption) | 14.7% | 10.0% |
| Prison data and justice | 1990-1995 | 1996-2005 |
| Prison population rates (per 100,000) | .. | 54 |
| 2000 Pre-trial detainees (% of prison population) | 33.1% | |

## ECONOMY

| Economic overview | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| HDI | 0.421 | 0.458 |
| GDP per capita (constant international US$ at PPP) | 1333.0 | 1614.8 |
| Gross domestic savings (% of GDP) | 11.1% | 10.0% |
| Gross fixed capital formation (% of GDP) | 14.7% | 20.3% |
| Net foreign direct investment inflows (as % of GDP) | 0.7% | 1.2% |
| Inflation consumer prices (annual %) | 7.9% | 0.5% |

| Economic overview (continued) | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| General government final consumption expenditure (% of GDP) | 12.4% | 14.3% |
| Agricultural labour force (% of total labour force) | 77%(a) | 63% |
| Military personnel (% of total labour force) | 0.5% | 0.4% |
| **Debt and aid** | | |
| External debt per capita (DOD constant 2000 US$) | 509.7 | 407.6 |
| ■ Debt service total (% of exports) | 16.8% | 8.7% |
| Aid per capita (constant 2000 US$) | 87.1 | 41.5 |
| Aid (% of GNI) | 15.4% | 7.0% |
| 2005 HIPC initiative (decision point/completion point) | Country has reached completion point | |
| **International trade** | | |
| Trade (% of GDP) | 74.6% | 66.7% |
| Food exports (% of merchandise exports) | 15.5% | 37.1% |
| Food imports (% of merchandise imports) | 32.5% | 29.6% |
| Manufactures exports (% of merchandise exports) | 49.8% | 34.3% |
| Manufactures imports (% of merchandise imports) | 53.3% | 47.4% |
| Fuel exports (% of merchandise exports) | 15.2% | 20.1% |
| Fuel imports (% of merchandise imports) | 10.0% | 18.6% |
| **Information and communication technology** | | |
| ■ Fixed line and mobile phone subscribers (per 1,000) | 9.8 | 77.7 |
| Television sets (per 1,000) | 27.6 | 39.7 |
| 2004 Total number of permanent post offices (per 100,000) | 1.3 | |
| Daily newspapers (per 1,000) | .. | |
| **Poverty and inequality** | | |
| 1995 National Gini index | 41.3 | |
| ■ 1995 Living on less than $1 a day (PPP) (% of population) | 22.3% | |
| ■ 1995 Living on less than $2 a day (PPP) (% of population) | 63.1% | |
| 1992 Poverty rate at national poverty line (% of population) | 33.4% | |
| 1992 Poverty rate at rural poverty line (% of rural population) | 40.4% | |
| 1992 Poverty rate at urban poverty line (% of urban population) | 23.7% | |
| 2003 HPI-1 rank – income poverty rank | 14 | |
| 2003 HDI rank – GDI rank | 1 | |
| **GOVERNANCE** | | |
| **Parliamentary development** | | |
| Lower or single house | Assemblée Nationale | |
| Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Lower or single house | 4/29/01 | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Parliamentary term in lower or single house (years) | 5 | |
| Parliamentarian obligation to declare personal assets | No | |
| **Participation** | | |
| 1998 Ratio of voters to registered voters (parliamentary) | 39.3% | |
| 1993 Ratio of voters to registered voters (presidential) | 51.5% | |
| Year women received right to vote | 1945 | |
| Year women received right to stand for election | 1945 | |
| 1993 Parliamentary bodies dealing with human rights | Committee on Laws, the Decentralisation of Labour and Human Rights | |
| **Aggregate indicators** | | |
| World Bank governance indicators | 1996 | 2004 |
| Voice and accountability | -0.2 | 0.2 |
| Political stability | -0.7 | -0.2 |
| Government effectiveness | -0.4 | -0.1 |
| Regulatory quality | -0.5 | -0.3 |
| Rule of law | -0.2 | -0.2 |
| Control of corruption | -0.4 | -0.4 |
| **ENVIRONMENT** | **1990-1995** | **2000-2004** |
| ■ Proportion of land area covered by forest (%) | 34.6% | 32.2% |
| ■ Ratio of protected area to surface area | 11% | 11% |
| ■ Carbon dioxide emissions (metric tons per capita) | 0.4 | 0.4 |

Notes: (a) 1990.

# Sierra Leone

■ = MDG

| COUNTRY OVERVIEW | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2004 | Population (In millions) | 5.4 | |
| 2004 | Population density (per sq km) | 75.9 | |
| 2004 | Urban population (% of total population) | 39.5% | |
| ■ 2001 | Slum population as percentage of urban population | 96% | |
| 2004 | Population female (% of total) | 50.9% | |
| 2004 | Age dependency ratio (dependents to working-age population) | | 0.84 |
| Indebtedness | | Severely indebted | |
| Independence date | | 1961 | |

| Committee for Development Policy LDC criteria | Inclusion | Graduation |
|---|---|---|
| Gap to threshold in % of current GNI per capita (US$) | -476.9% | -592.3% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current HAI score | -153.5% | -181.1% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current EVI score | -19.0% | -27.8% |

| MDGs progress | 1990-2000 |
|---|---|
| ■ MDG Hunger | Reversal/stagnation |
| ■ MDG Primary education | .. |
| ■ MDG Gender equality in education | Low progress |
| ■ MDG Child mortality | Reversal/stagnation |
| ■ MDG Access to water | .. |

## WELL-BEING

| Health | 1990 | 2003 |
|---|---|---|
| Life expectancy at birth (years, male and female combined) | 35.2 | 37.4 |
| Fertility rate (births per woman) | 6.5 | 5.6 |
| ■ Under five mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) | 302 | 284 |
| | 1993-1998 | 1999-2004 |
| Physicians (per 1,000) | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| ■ Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total) | .. | 41.7% |

| Education | 2000-2004 | |
|---|---|---|
| Legal guarantee of primary free education | No legal guarantee | |
| Adult literacy (% of people ages 15 and above) | 29.6% | |
| Youth literacy (% age 15-24) | 38.2% | |
| Ratio of literate females to literate males (ages 15 and above) | 51.5% | |
| Ratio of literate females to males (ages 15-24) | 63.8% | |
| | 1999/2000 | 2002/2003 |
| ■ School enrolment primary (% gross) | 65% | 79%(a) |
| Pupil-teacher ratio primary | 37% | ..(a) |
| School enrolment secondary (% gross) | .. | 26%(a) |

| Public responsibility | 1999 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| Public expenditure on health (% of GDP) | 2.0% | 1.7% |
| General government expenditure on health (% of total government expenditure) | 9.4% | 6.8% |
| Out-of-pocket expenditure on health (% of total health expenditure) | 46.2% | 39.7% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of GDP) | 1.0%(b) | 3.7%(a) |
| Public expenditure on education (% of government expenditure) | .. | .. |
| Military expenditure (% of GDP) | 1.1%(c) | 1.7% |
| Military expenditure (% of government final consumption) | .. | .. |
| Prison data and justice | 1990-1995 | 1996-2005 |
| Prison population rates (per 100,000) | .. | 27 |
| Pre-trial detainees (% of prison population) | .. | |

## ECONOMY

| Economic overview | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| HDI | .. | 0.298 |
| GDP per capita (constant international US$ at PPP) | 629.7 | 754.1 |
| Gross domestic savings (% of GDP) | -2.1% | -10.7% |
| Gross fixed capital formation (% of GDP) | 5.6% | 19.6% |
| Net foreign direct investment inflows (as % of GDP) | 0.8% | 0.3% |

| Economic overview (continued) | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| Inflation consumer prices (annual %) | 26.0% | 14.2% |
| General government final consumption expenditure (% of GDP) | 14.0% | 13.2% |
| Agricultural labour force (% of total labour force) | 67%(d) | 61% |
| Military personnel (% of total labour force) | 0.4% | 0.7% |
| **Debt and aid** | | |
| External debt per capita (DOD constant 2000 US$) | 300.9 | 285.3 |
| ■ Debt service total (% of exports) | 54.3% | 12.4% |
| Aid per capita (constant 2000 US$) | 49.7 | 52.6 |
| Aid (% of GNI) | 24.4% | 30.9% |
| 2005 HIPC initiative (decision point/completion point) | Country has reached decision point | |
| **International trade** | | |
| Trade (% of GDP) | 42.2% | 80.5% |
| Food exports (% of merchandise exports) | .. | 91.6% |
| Food imports (% of merchandise imports) | .. | 22.5% |
| Manufactures exports (% of merchandise exports) | .. | 7.5% |
| Manufactures imports (% of merchandise imports) | .. | 29.3% |
| Fuel exports (% of merchandise exports) | .. | .. |
| Fuel imports (% of merchandise imports) | .. | 39.7% |
| **Information and communication technology** | | |
| ■ Fixed line and mobile phone subscribers (per 1,000) | 3.7 | 18.2 |
| Television sets (per 1,000) | 11.0 | 13.2(e) |
| 2002 Total number of permanent post offices (per 100,000) | 0.9 | |
| Daily newspapers (per 1,000) | .. | |
| **Poverty and inequality** | | |
| 1989 National Gini index | 62.9 | |
| ■ Living on less than $1 a day (PPP) (% of population) | .. | |
| ■ Living on less than $2 a day (PPP) (% of population) | .. | |
| 2004 Poverty rate at national poverty line (% of population) | 70.2% | |
| 2004 Poverty rate at rural poverty line (% of rural population) | 79.0% | |
| Poverty rate at urban poverty line (% of urban population) | 56.4% | |
| 2003 HPI-1 rank – income poverty rank | 4 | |
| 2003 HDI rank – GDI rank | 0 | |
| **GOVERNANCE** | | |
| **Parliamentary development** | | |
| Lower or single house | Parliament | |
| Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Lower or single house | 5/14/02 | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Parliamentary term in lower or single house (years) | 5 | |
| Parliamentarian obligation to declare personal assets | No | |
| **Participation** | | |
| 2002 Ratio of voters to registered voters (parliamentary) | 83.3% | |
| 2002 Ratio of voters to registered voters (presidential) | 81.4% | |
| Year women received right to vote | 1961 | |
| Year women received right to stand for election | 1961 | |
| Parliamentary bodies dealing with human rights | .. | |
| **Aggregate indicators** | | |
| World Bank governance indicators | 1996 | 2004 |
| Voice and accountability | -1.4 | -0.5 |
| Political stability | -2.3 | -0.6 |
| Government effectiveness | -0.2 | -1.3 |
| Regulatory quality | -0.5 | -1.0 |
| Rule of law | -1.0 | -1.1 |
| Control of corruption | -1.7 | -0.9 |
| **ENVIRONMENT** | **1990-1995** | **2000-2004** |
| ■ Proportion of land area covered by forest (%) | 19.8% | 14.7% |
| ■ Ratio of protected area to surface area | 4% | 4% |
| ■ Carbon dioxide emissions (metric tons per capita) | 0.1 | 0.1 |

Notes: (a) 2000/2001; (b) 1998/1999; (c) 1997; (d) 1990; (e) 2001.

# Solomon Islands

■ = MDG

## COUNTRY OVERVIEW

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2004 | Population (In millions) | 0.5 | |
| 2004 | Population density (per sq km) | 16.8 | |
| 2004 | Urban population (% of total population) | 16.8% | |
| ■ 2001 | Slum population as percentage of urban population | 8% | |
| 2004 | Population female (% of total) | 49.8% | |
| 2004 | Age dependency ratio (dependents to working-age population) | | 0.90 |
| Indebtedness | | Less indebted | |
| Independence date | | 1978 | |

| Committee for Development Policy LDC criteria | Inclusion | Graduation |
|---|---|---|
| Gap to threshold in % of current GNI per capita (US$) | -14.2% | -37.0% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current HAI score | -16.3% | -29.0% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current EVI score | -20.8% | -29.3% |

| MDGs progress | 1990-2000 |
|---|---|
| ■ MDG Hunger | .. |
| ■ MDG Primary education | .. |
| ■ MDG Gender equality in education | .. |
| ■ MDG Child mortality | Achievable by 2015 |
| ■ MDG Access to water | .. |

## WELL-BEING

| Health | 1990 | 2003 |
|---|---|---|
| Life expectancy at birth (years, male and female combined) | 64.5 | 69.5 |
| Fertility rate (births per woman) | 5.9 | 5.3 |
| ■ Under five mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) | 36 | 22 |
| | 1993-1998 | 1999-2004 |
| Physicians (per 1,000) | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| ■ Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total) | 85.0% | 85.0% |

| Education | 2000-2004 | |
|---|---|---|
| Legal guarantee of primary free education | No legal guarantee | |
| Adult literacy (% of people ages 15 and above) | .. | |
| Youth literacy (% age 15-24) | .. | |
| Ratio of literate females to literate males (ages 15 and above) | .. | |
| Ratio of literate females to males (ages 15-24) | .. | |
| | 1999/2000 | 2002/2003 |
| ■ School enrolment primary (% gross) | .. | 107% |
| Pupil-teacher ratio primary | .. | .. |
| School enrolment secondary (% gross) | .. | 61% |

| Public responsibility | 1999 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| Public expenditure on health (% of GDP) | 4.6% | 4.5% |
| General government expenditure on health (% of total government expenditure) | 11.1% | 11.8% |
| Out-of-pocket expenditure on health (% of total health expenditure) | 3.1% | 3.3% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of GDP) | 3.2% | .. |
| Public expenditure on education (% of government expenditure) | 15.4% | .. |
| Military expenditure (% of GDP) | .. | .. |
| Military expenditure (% of government final consumption) | .. | .. |
| Prison data and justice | 1990-1995 | 1996-2005 |
| Prison population rates (per 100,000) | 40 | 59 |
| 2005 Pre-trial detainees (% of prison population) | 34.5% | |

## ECONOMY

| Economic overview | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| HDI | .. | 0.594 |
| GDP per capita (constant international US$ at PPP) | 2459.1 | 1641.4 |
| Gross domestic savings (% of GDP) | 3.0%(a) | .. |
| Gross fixed capital formation (% of GDP) | .. | .. |
| Net foreign direct investment inflows (as % of GDP) | 0.6% | -0.9% |
| Inflation consumer prices (annual %) | 9.6% | 7.1% |

| Economic overview (continued) | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| General government final consumption expenditure (% of GDP) | 27.5%(a) | .. |
| Agricultural labour force (% of total labour force) | 77%(a) | 72% |
| Military personnel (% of total labour force) | .. | .. |
| **Debt and aid** | | |
| External debt per capita (DOD constant 2000 US$) | 469.6 | 384.2 |
| ■ Debt service total (% of exports) | 3.8% | 4.8% |
| Aid per capita (constant 2000 US$) | 141.3 | 124.6 |
| Aid (% of GNI) | 14.9% | 26.1% |
| 2005 HIPC initiative (decision point/completion point) | .. | |
| **International trade** | | |
| Trade (% of GDP) | 135.5% | 64.8% |
| Food exports (% of merchandise exports) | .. | .. |
| Food imports (% of merchandise imports) | 16.3%(b) | .. |
| Manufactures exports (% of merchandise exports) | .. | .. |
| Manufactures imports (% of merchandise imports) | 55.1%(b) | .. |
| Fuel exports (% of merchandise exports) | .. | .. |
| Fuel imports (% of merchandise imports) | 24.7%(b) | .. |
| **Information and communication technology** | | |
| ■ Fixed line and mobile phone subscribers (per 1,000) | 18.4 | 16.2 |
| Television sets (per 1,000) | 6.8 | 10.5 |
| 2003 Total number of permanent post offices (per 100,000) | 5.9 | |
| Daily newspapers (per 1,000) | .. | |
| **Poverty and inequality** | | |
| National Gini index | .. | |
| ■ Living on less than $1 a day (PPP) (% of population) | .. | |
| ■ Living on less than $2 a day (PPP) (% of population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at national poverty line (% of population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at rural poverty line (% of rural population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at urban poverty line (% of urban population) | .. | |
| HPI-1 rank – income poverty rank | .. | |
| HDI rank – GDI rank | .. | |
| **GOVERNANCE** | | |
| **Parliamentary development** | | |
| Lower or single house | National Parliament | |
| Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Lower or single house | 12/5/01 | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Parliamentary term in lower or single house (years) | 4 | |
| Parliamentarian obligation to declare personal assets | No | |
| **Participation** | | |
| 1997 Ratio of voters to registered voters (parliamentary) | 68.4% | |
| Ratio of voters to registered voters (presidential) | .. | |
| Year women received right to vote | 1974 | |
| Year women received right to stand for election | 1974 | |
| Parliamentary bodies dealing with human rights | .. | |
| **Aggregate indicators** | | |
| World Bank governance indicators | 1996 | 2004 |
| Voice and accountability | 1.1 | 0.1 |
| Political stability | .. | -0.7 |
| Government effectiveness | -1.1 | -1.8 |
| Regulatory quality | -1.2 | -1.5 |
| Rule of law | -0.7(c) | -1.2 |
| Control of corruption | -0.5(c) | -1.2 |
| **ENVIRONMENT** | **1990-1995** | **2000-2004** |
| ■ Proportion of land area covered by forest (%) | 90.3% | 88.8% |
| ■ Ratio of protected area to surface area | 0% | 0% |
| ■ Carbon dioxide emissions (metric tons per capita) | 0.4 | 0.4 |

Notes: (a) 1990; (b) 1996; (c) 1998.

# Somalia

■ = MDG

| COUNTRY OVERVIEW | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2004 | Population (In millions) | 9.9 | |
| 2004 | Population density (per sq km) | 15.8 | |
| 2004 | Urban population (% of total population) | 35.4% | |
| ■ 2001 | Slum population as percentage of urban population | 97% | |
| 2004 | Population female (% of total) | 50.4% | |
| 2004 | Age dependency ratio (dependents to working-age population) | | 1.01 |
| Indebtedness | | Severely indebted | |
| Independence date | | 1960 | |

| Committee for Development Policy LDC criteria | Inclusion | Graduation |
|---|---|---|
| Gap to threshold in % of current GNI per capita (US$) | -323.7% | -408.5% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current HAI score | -547.1% | -617.6% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current EVI score | -33.2% | -40.4% |

| MDGs progress | 1990-2000 |
|---|---|
| ■ MDG Hunger | Reversal/stagnation |
| ■ MDG Primary education | .. |
| ■ MDG Gender equality in education | .. |
| ■ MDG Child mortality | Reversal/stagnation |
| ■ MDG Access to water | .. |

## WELL-BEING

| Health | 1990 | 2003 |
|---|---|---|
| Life expectancy at birth (years, male and female combined) | 41.6 | 47.4 |
| Fertility rate (births per woman) | 7.3 | 6.9 |
| ■ Under five mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) | 225 | 225 |
| | 1993-1998 | 1999-2004 |
| Physicians (per 1,000) | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| ■ Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total) | .. | 34.2% |

| Education | 2000-2004 | |
|---|---|---|
| Legal guarantee of primary free education | .. | |
| Adult literacy (% of people ages 15 and above) | .. | |
| Youth literacy (% age 15-24) | .. | |
| Ratio of literate females to literate males (ages 15 and above) | .. | |
| Ratio of literate females to males (ages 15-24) | .. | |
| | 1999/2000 | 2002/2003 |
| ■ School enrolment primary (% gross) | .. | .. |
| Pupil-teacher ratio primary | .. | .. |
| School enrolment secondary (% gross) | .. | .. |

| Public responsibility | 1999 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| Public expenditure on health (% of GDP) | 1.2% | 1.2% |
| General government expenditure on health (% of total government expenditure) | 4.2% | 4.2% |
| Out-of-pocket expenditure on health (% of total health expenditure) | 55.0% | 55.4% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of GDP) | .. | .. |
| Public expenditure on education (% of government expenditure) | .. | .. |
| Military expenditure (% of GDP) | .. | .. |
| Military expenditure (% of government final consumption) | .. | .. |
| Prison data and justice | 1990-1995 | 1996-2005 |
| Prison population rates (per 100,000) | .. | .. |
| Pre-trial detainees (% of prison population) | .. | |

## ECONOMY

| Economic overview | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| HDI | .. | .. |
| GDP per capita (constant international US$ at PPP) | .. | .. |
| Gross domestic savings (% of GDP) | -12.5%(a) | .. |
| Gross fixed capital formation (% of GDP) | 14.9%(a) | .. |
| Net foreign direct investment inflows (as % of GDP) | 0.6%(a) | .. |

| Economic overview (continued) | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| Inflation consumer prices (annual %) | .. | .. |
| General government final consumption expenditure (% of GDP) | .. | .. |
| Agricultural labour force (% of total labour force) | 75%(a) | 70% |
| Military personnel (% of total labour force) | 7.0% | .. |
| **Debt and aid** | | |
| External debt per capita (DOD constant 2000 US$) | 395.4 | 278.5 |
| ■ Debt service total (% of exports) | .. | .. |
| Aid per capita (constant 2000 US$) | 27.9 | 17.2 |
| Aid (% of GNI) | 59.1%(a) | .. |
| 2005 HIPC initiative (decision point/completion point) | Country still to be considered | |
| **International trade** | | |
| Trade (% of GDP) | 47.5%(a) | .. |
| Food exports (% of merchandise exports) | .. | 82.9% |
| Food imports (% of merchandise imports) | .. | 32.2%(b) |
| Manufactures exports (% of merchandise exports) | .. | 1.5%(b) |
| Manufactures imports (% of merchandise imports) | .. | 58.5%(b) |
| Fuel exports (% of merchandise exports) | .. | 0.0%(b) |
| Fuel imports (% of merchandise imports) | .. | 5.0%(b) |
| **Information and communication technology** | | |
| ■ Fixed line and mobile phone subscribers (per 1,000) | 1.7 | 13.3 |
| Television sets (per 1,000) | 13.7 | 20.2 |
| Total number of permanent post offices (per 100,000) | .. | |
| Daily newspapers (per 1,000) | .. | |
| **Poverty and inequality** | | |
| National Gini index | .. | |
| ■ Living on less than $1 a day (PPP) (% of population) | .. | |
| ■ Living on less than $2 a day (PPP) (% of population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at national poverty line (% of population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at rural poverty line (% of rural population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at urban poverty line (% of urban population) | .. | |
| HPI-1 rank – income poverty rank | .. | |
| HDI rank – GDI rank | .. | |
| **GOVERNANCE** | | |
| **Parliamentary development** | | |
| Lower or single house | Transitional Federal Parliament | |
| Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Lower or single house | 8/20/04 | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Parliamentary term in lower or single house (years) | 4 | |
| Parliamentarian obligation to declare personal assets | No | |
| **Participation** | | |
| Ratio of voters to registered voters (parliamentary) | .. | |
| Ratio of voters to registered voters (presidential) | .. | |
| Year women received right to vote | 1956 | |
| Year women received right to stand for election | 1956 | |
| Parliamentary bodies dealing with human rights | .. | |
| **Aggregate indicators** | | |
| World Bank governance indicators | 1996 | 2004 |
| Voice and accountability | -1.9 | -1.6 |
| Political stability | -2.1 | -2.4 |
| Government effectiveness | -2.2 | -2.3 |
| Regulatory quality | -2.9 | -2.6 |
| Rule of law | -1.7 | -2.3 |
| Control of corruption | -1.7 | -1.6 |
| **ENVIRONMENT** | **1990-1995** | **2000-2004** |
| ■ Proportion of land area covered by forest (%) | 13.2% | 12.0% |
| ■ Ratio of protected area to surface area | 1% | 1% |
| ■ Carbon dioxide emissions (metric tons per capita) | 0.0 | .. |

Notes: (a) 1990; (b) 2000.

# Sudan

■ = MDG

| COUNTRY OVERVIEW | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2004 | Population (In millions) | 34.4 | |
| 2004 | Population density (per sq km) | 14.5 | |
| 2004 | Urban population (% of total population) | 39.9% | |
| ■ 2001 | Slum population as percentage of urban population | 86% | |
| 2004 | Population female (% of total) | 49.7% | |
| 2004 | Age dependency ratio (dependents to working-age population) | | 0.75 |
| Indebtedness | | Severely indebted | |
| Independence date | | 1956 | |

| Committee for Development Policy LDC criteria | Inclusion | Graduation |
|---|---|---|
| Gap to threshold in % of current GNI per capita (US$) | -125.2% | -170.3% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current HAI score | -18.5% | -31.5% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current EVI score | -18.1% | -27.0% |

| MDGs progress | 1990-2000 |
|---|---|
| ■ MDG Hunger | Achievable by 2015 |
| ■ MDG Primary education | .. |
| ■ MDG Gender equality in education | Achieved |
| ■ MDG Child mortality | Low progress |
| ■ MDG Access to water | Achievable by 2015 |

## WELL-BEING

| Health | 1990 | 2003 |
|---|---|---|
| Life expectancy at birth (years, male and female combined) | 52.2 | 58.6 |
| Fertility rate (births per woman) | 5.4 | 4.4 |
| ■ Under five mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) | 120 | 93 |
| | 1993-1998 | 1999-2004 |
| Physicians (per 1,000) | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| ■ Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total) | 86.3% | .. |

| Education | 2000-2004 | |
|---|---|---|
| Legal guarantee of primary free education | Free education guaranteed | |
| Adult literacy (% of people ages 15 and above) | 59.0% | |
| Youth literacy (% age 15-24) | 74.6% | |
| Ratio of literate females to literate males (ages 15 and above) | 72.0% | |
| Ratio of literate females to males (ages 15-24) | 84.8% | |
| | 1999/2000 | 2002/2003 |
| ■ School enrolment primary (% gross) | 54% | 60% |
| Pupil-teacher ratio primary | .. | 29% |
| School enrolment secondary (% gross) | 28% | 35% |

| Public responsibility | 1999 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| Public expenditure on health (% of GDP) | 0.8% | 1.0% |
| General government expenditure on health (% of total government expenditure) | 7.2% | 6.3% |
| Out-of-pocket expenditure on health (% of total health expenditure) | 83.9% | 78.9% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of GDP) | .. | .. |
| Public expenditure on education (% of government expenditure) | .. | .. |
| Military expenditure (% of GDP) | 2.4% | 2.4%(a) |
| Military expenditure (% of government final consumption) | 35.7% | 34.9%(a) |
| Prison data and justice | 1990-1995 | 1996-2005 |
| Prison population rates (per 100,000) | .. | 36 |
| **2003 PRE-TRIAL DETAINEES (% OF PRISON POPULATION)** | **10.0%** | |

| Economy | | |
|---|---|---|
| Economic overview | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
| HDI | 0.465 | 0.512 |
| GDP per capita (constant international US$ at PPP) | 1410.7 | 1868.9 |
| Gross domestic savings (% of GDP) | 10.2%(b) | 5.9% |
| Gross fixed capital formation (% of GDP) | 12.0%(b) | 20.0% |
| Net foreign direct investment inflows (as % of GDP) | 0.0% | 7.6% |
| Inflation consumer prices (annual %) | 68.4% | 5.8%(c) |

| Economic overview (continued) | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| General government final consumption expenditure (% of GDP) | 7.3%(b) | 12.2% |
| Agricultural labour force (% of total labour force) | 69%(d) | 59% |
| Military personnel (% of total labour force) | 1.2% | 0.9% |
| **Debt and aid** | | |
| External debt per capita (DOD constant 2000 US$) | 680.8 | 492.7 |
| ■ Debt service total (% of exports) | 6.7% | 0.9% |
| Aid per capita (constant 2000 US$) | 9.4 | 17.5 |
| Aid (% of GNI) | 3.9% | 3.8% |
| 2005 HIPC initiative (decision point/completion point) | Country still to be considered | |
| **International trade** | | |
| Trade (% of GDP) | 27.3%(b) | 28.4% |
| Food exports (% of merchandise exports) | 44.5% | 18.3% |
| Food imports (% of merchandise imports) | 24.4% | 18.7% |
| Manufactures exports (% of merchandise exports) | 6.3% | 3.3% |
| Manufactures imports (% of merchandise imports) | 59.4% | 74.4% |
| Fuel exports (% of merchandise exports) | 0.3% | 72.4% |
| Fuel imports (% of merchandise imports) | 13.9% | 4.8% |
| **Information and communication technology** | | |
| ■ Fixed line and mobile phone subscribers (per 1,000) | 2.8 | 46.6 |
| Television sets (per 1,000) | 84.9 | 386.4 |
| 2004 Total number of permanent post offices (per 100,000) | 0.6 | |
| Daily newspapers (per 1,000) | .. | |
| **Poverty and inequality** | | |
| National Gini index | .. | |
| ■ Living on less than $1 a day (PPP) (% of population) | .. | |
| ■ Living on less than $2 a day (PPP) (% of population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at national poverty line (% of population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at rural poverty line (% of rural population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at urban poverty line (% of urban population) | .. | |
| HPI-1 rank – income poverty rank | .. | |
| 2003 HDI rank – GDI rank | -2 | |

**GOVERNANCE**

| Parliamentary development | |
|---|---|
| Lower or single house | Majlis Watani |
| Upper house or senate | .. |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Lower or single house | 8/31/05 |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Upper house or senate | .. |
| Parliamentary term in lower or single house (years) | 4 |
| Parliamentarian obligation to declare personal assets | No |
| **Participation** | |
| 1996 Ratio of voters to registered voters (parliamentary) | 72.2% |
| 1996 Ratio of voters to registered voters (presidential) | 72.2% |
| Year women received right to vote | 1964 |
| Year women received right to stand for election | 1964 |
| .. Parliamentary bodies dealing with human rights | Human Rights Committee |

| Aggregate indicators | | |
|---|---|---|
| World Bank governance indicators | 1996 | 2004 |
| Voice and accountability | -1.7 | -1.8 |
| Political stability | -2.7 | -2.1 |
| Government effectiveness | -1.5 | -1.3 |
| Regulatory quality | -1.7 | -1.0 |
| Rule of law | -1.5 | -1.6 |
| Control of corruption | -1.1 | -1.3 |

| ENVIRONMENT | 1990-1995 | 2000-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| ■ Proportion of land area covered by forest (%) | 30.0% | 25.9% |
| ■ Ratio of protected area to surface area | 5% | 5% |
| ■ Carbon dioxide emissions (metric tons per capita) | 0.1 | 0.3 |

Notes: (a) 2000; (b) 1996; (c) 2001; (d) 1990.

# Timor-Leste

■ = MDG

| COUNTRY OVERVIEW | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2004 | Population (In millions) | 0.9 | |
| 2004 | Population density (per sq km) | 62.2 | |
| 2004 | Urban population (% of total population) | 7.7% | |
| ■ 2001 | Slum population as percentage of urban population | 12% | |
| 2004 | Population female (% of total) | 49.4% | |
| 2004 | Age dependency ratio (dependents to working-age population) | | 0.73 |
| Indebtedness | | Not classified | |
| Independence date | | 1999 | |

| Committee for Development Policy LDC criteria | Inclusion | Graduation |
|---|---|---|
| Gap to threshold in % of current GNI per capita (US$) | -56.9% | -88.3% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current HAI score | -51.1% | -67.6% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current EVI score | .. | .. |

| MDGs progress | 1990-2000 |
|---|---|
| ■ MDG Hunger | .. |
| ■ MDG Primary education | .. |
| ■ MDG Gender equality in education | .. |
| ■ MDG Child mortality | .. |
| ■ MDG Access to water | .. |

## WELL-BEING

| Health | 1990 | 2003 |
|---|---|---|
| Life expectancy at birth (years, male and female combined) | .. | 62.2 |
| Fertility rate (births per woman) | .. | 7.6 |
| ■ Under five mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) | 160 | 124 |
| | 1993-1998 | 1999-2004 |
| Physicians (per 1,000) | .. | .. |
| ■ Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total) | 25.8% | 24.0% |

| Education | 2000-2004 | |
|---|---|---|
| Legal guarantee of primary free education | .. | |
| Adult literacy (% of people ages 15 and above) | .. | |
| Youth literacy (% age 15-24) | .. | |
| Ratio of literate females to literate males (ages 15 and above) | .. | |
| Ratio of literate females to males (ages 15-24) | .. | |
| | 1999/2000 | 2002/2003 |
| ■ School enrolment primary (% gross) | 142%(a) | 143% |
| Pupil-teacher ratio primary | 51% | 51%(b) |
| School enrolment secondary (% gross) | 31%(a) | 35%(b) |

| Public responsibility | 1999 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| Public expenditure on health (% of GDP) | 6.0% | 6.2% |
| General government expenditure on health (% of total government expenditure) | 7.7% | 9.0% |
| Out-of-pocket expenditure on health (% of total health expenditure) | 11.6% | 18.7% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of GDP) | .. | .. |
| Public expenditure on education (% of government expenditure) | .. | .. |
| Military expenditure (% of GDP) | .. | .. |
| Military expenditure (% of government final consumption) | .. | .. |
| Prison data and justice | 1990-1995 | 1996-2005 |
| Prison population rates (per 100,000) | .. | 41 |
| 2003 Pre-trial detainees (% of prison population) | 70.9% | |

## ECONOMY

| Economic overview | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| HDI | .. | 0.513 |
| GDP per capita (constant international US$ at PPP) | .. | .. |
| Gross domestic savings (% of GDP) | -13.0%(c) | -47.0%(d) |
| Gross fixed capital formation (% of GDP) | .. | .. |
| Net foreign direct investment inflows (as % of GDP) | .. | .. |
| Inflation consumer prices (annual %) | .. | .. |

| Economic overview (continued) | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| General government final consumption expenditure (% of GDP) | .. | .. |
| Agricultural labour force (% of total labour force) | .. | .. |
| Military personnel (% of total labour force) | .. | .. |
| **Debt and aid** | | |
| External debt per capita (DOD constant 2000 US$) | .. | .. |
| ■ Debt service total (% of exports) | .. | .. |
| Aid per capita (constant 2000 US$) | 0.0 | 162.4 |
| Aid (% of GNI) | ..(e) | 40.6% |
| 2005 HIPC initiative (decision point/completion point) | .. | |
| **International trade** | | |
| Trade (% of GDP) | .. | .. |
| Food exports (% of merchandise exports) | .. | .. |
| Food imports (% of merchandise imports) | .. | .. |
| Manufactures exports (% of merchandise exports) | .. | .. |
| Manufactures imports (% of merchandise imports) | .. | .. |
| Fuel exports (% of merchandise exports) | .. | .. |
| Fuel imports (% of merchandise imports) | .. | .. |
| **Information and communication technology** | | |
| ■ Fixed line and mobile phone subscribers (per 1,000) | .. | .. |
| Television sets (per 1,000) | .. | .. |
| 2004 Total number of permanent post offices (per 100,000) | 0.5 | |
| Daily newspapers (per 1,000) | .. | |
| **Poverty and inequality** | | |
| National Gini index | .. | |
| ■ Living on less than $1 a day (PPP) (% of population) | .. | |
| ■ Living on less than $2 a day (PPP) (% of population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at national poverty line (% of population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at rural poverty line (% of rural population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at urban poverty line (% of urban population) | .. | |
| HPI-1 rank – income poverty rank | .. | |
| HDI rank – GDI rank | .. | |
| **GOVERNANCE** | | |
| **Parliamentary development** | | |
| Lower or single house | National Parliament | |
| Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Lower or single house | 8/30/01 | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Parliamentary term in lower or single house (years) | 5 | |
| Parliamentarian obligation to declare personal assets | No | |
| **Participation** | | |
| 2001 Ratio of voters to registered voters (parliamentary) | 86.0% | |
| Ratio of voters to registered voters (presidential) | .. | |
| Year women received right to vote | ..(f) | |
| Year women received right to stand for election | ..(f) | |
| Parliamentary bodies dealing with human rights | .. | |
| **Aggregate indicators** | | |
| World Bank governance indicators | 1996 | 2004 |
| Voice and accountability | 0.2(g) | 0.3 |
| Political stability | -0.9(g) | -0.6 |
| Government effectiveness | -0.9(g) | -1.2 |
| Regulatory quality | -1.2(g) | -0.4 |
| Rule of law | -1.1(g) | -0.6 |
| Control of corruption | -0.5(g) | -0.3 |
| **ENVIRONMENT** | **1990-1995** | **2000-2004** |
| ■ Proportion of land area covered by forest (%) | 36.6% | 34.3% |
| ■ Ratio of protected area to surface area | .. | .. |
| ■ Carbon dioxide emissions (metric tons per capita) | .. | .. |

Notes: (a) 2000/2001; (b) 2001/2002; (c) 1999; (d) 2001; (e) 1998; (f) no data; (g) 2002.

# Togo

■ = MDG

## COUNTRY OVERVIEW

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2004 | Population (In millions) | 5.0 | |
| 2004 | Population density (per sq km) | 91.3 | |
| 2004 | Urban population (% of total population) | 35.8% | |
| ■ 2001 | Slum population as percentage of urban population | 81% | |
| 2004 | Population female (% of total) | 50.4% | |
| 2004 | Age dependency ratio (dependents to working-age population) | | 0.85 |
| Indebtedness | | Severely indebted | |

| **Independence date** | **1960** | |
|---|---|---|
| Committee for Development Policy LDC criteria | Inclusion | Graduation |
| Gap to threshold in % of current GNI per capita (US$) | -156.0% | -207.2% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current HAI score | -13.2% | -25.5% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current EVI score | -10.8% | -20.5% |

| **MDGs progress** | **1990-2000** |
|---|---|
| ■ MDG Hunger | Achievable by 2015 |
| ■ MDG Primary education | Achievable by 2015 |
| ■ MDG Gender equality in education | Low progress |
| ■ MDG Child mortality | Low progress |
| ■ MDG Access to water | Low progress |

## WELL-BEING

| **Health** | **1990** | **2003** |
|---|---|---|
| Life expectancy at birth (years, male and female combined) | 50.5 | 49.7 |
| Fertility rate (births per woman) | 6.6 | 4.9 |
| ■ Under five mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) | 152 | 140 |
| | 1993-1998 | 1999-2004 |
| Physicians (per 1,000) | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| ■ Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total) | .. | 48.6% |

| **Education** | **2000-2004** | |
|---|---|---|
| Legal guarantee of primary free education | Progressive realization or partial guarantees | |
| Adult literacy (% of people ages 15 and above) | 53.0% | |
| Youth literacy (% age 15-24) | 74.0% | |
| Ratio of literate females to literate males (ages 15 and above) | 56.0% | |
| Ratio of literate females to males (ages 15-24) | 76.1% | |
| | 1999/2000 | 2002/2003 |
| ■ School enrolment primary (% gross) | 123% | 121% |
| Pupil-teacher ratio primary | 37% | 35% |
| School enrolment secondary (% gross) | 36% | .. |

| **Public responsibility** | **1999** | **2002-2004** |
|---|---|---|
| Public expenditure on health (% of GDP) | 4.4% | 5.1% |
| General government expenditure on health (% of total government expenditure) | 12.4% | 7.8% |
| Out-of-pocket expenditure on health (% of total health expenditure) | 72.2% | 83.3% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of GDP) | 4.2% | 2.6% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of government expenditure) | 26.2% | 13.6% |
| Military expenditure (% of GDP) | 2.4% | 1.6% |
| Military expenditure (% of government final consumption) | 21.7%(a) | 16.5% |
| Prison data and justice | 1990-1995 | 1996-2005 |
| Prison population rates (per 100,000) | .. | 65 |
| 1998 Pre-trial detainees (% of prison population) | 55.4% | |

## ECONOMY

| **Economic overview** | **1995** | **2002-2004** |
|---|---|---|
| HDI | 0.51 | 0.512 |
| GDP per capita (constant international US$ at PPP) | 1527.3 | 1591.9 |
| Gross domestic savings (% of GDP) | 11.2% | 4.5% |
| Gross fixed capital formation (% of GDP) | 13.6% | 21.2% |
| Net foreign direct investment inflows (as % of GDP) | 2.0% | 1.1% |
| Inflation consumer prices (annual %) | 16.4% | 0.4% |

| Economic overview (continued) | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| General government final consumption expenditure (% of GDP) | 12.1% | 9.7% |
| Agricultural labour force (% of total labour force) | 66%(b) | 59% |
| Military personnel (% of total labour force) | 0.5% | 0.4% |
| **Debt and aid** | | |
| External debt per capita (DOD constant 2000 US$) | 414.2 | 331.8 |
| ■ Debt service total (% of exports) | 6.0% | 1.9% |
| Aid per capita (constant 2000 US$) | 54.0 | 8.7 |
| Aid (% of GNI) | 15.2% | 2.6% |
| 2005 HIPC initiative (decision point/completion point) | Country still to be considered | |
| **International trade** | | |
| Trade (% of GDP) | 69.8% | 80.5% |
| Food exports (% of merchandise exports) | 18.5% | 15.5% |
| Food imports (% of merchandise imports) | 18.4% | 17.1% |
| Manufactures exports (% of merchandise exports) | 7.3% | 58.0% |
| Manufactures imports (% of merchandise imports) | 48.5% | 61.2% |
| Fuel exports (% of merchandise exports) | 0.0% | 0.3% |
| Fuel imports (% of merchandise imports) | 29.9% | 18.8% |
| **Information and communication technology** | | |
| ■ Fixed line and mobile phone subscribers (per 1,000) | 5.2 | 56.1 |
| Television sets (per 1,000) | 12.1 | 123.1 |
| 2004 Total number of permanent post offices (per 100,000) | 1.1 | |
| 2000 Daily newspapers (per 1,000) | 2.2 | |
| **Poverty and inequality** | | |
| National Gini index | .. | |
| ■ Living on less than $1 a day (PPP) (% of population) | .. | |
| ■ Living on less than $2 a day (PPP) (% of population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at national poverty line (% of population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at rural poverty line (% of rural population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at urban poverty line (% of urban population) | .. | |
| HPI-1 rank – income poverty rank | .. | |
| HDI rank – GDI rank | -2 | |
| **GOVERNANCE** | | |
| **Parliamentary development** | | |
| Lower or single house | Assemblée Nationale | |
| Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Lower or single house | 10/27/02 | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Parliamentary term in lower or single house (years) | 5 | |
| Parliamentarian obligation to declare personal assets | Yes | |
| **Participation** | | |
| 1994 Ratio of voters to registered voters (parliamentary) | 65.1% | |
| 1998 Ratio of voters to registered voters (presidential) | 69.8% | |
| Year women received right to vote | 1945 | |
| Year women received right to stand for election | 1945 | |
| 1994 Parliamentary bodies dealing with human rights | Human Rights Committee | |
| **Aggregate indicators** | | |
| World Bank governance indicators | 1996 | 2004 |
| Voice and accountability | -1.1 | -1.2 |
| Political stability | -0.6 | -0.5 |
| Government effectiveness | -0.7 | -1.3 |
| Regulatory quality | 0.2 | -0.8 |
| Rule of law | -1.2 | -1.0 |
| Control of corruption | -1.0 | -0.9 |
| **ENVIRONMENT** | **1990-1995** | **2000-2004** |
| ■ Proportion of land area covered by forest (%) | 13.2% | 9.4% |
| ■ Ratio of protected area to surface area | 11% | 11% |
| ■ Carbon dioxide emissions (metric tons per capita) | 0.2 | 0.3 |

Notes: (a) 1995; (b) 1990.

# Tuvalu

■ = MDG

## COUNTRY OVERVIEW

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2004 | Population (In millions) | 0.0 | |
| 2005 | Population density (per sq km) | 402.0 | |
| 2005 | Urban population (% of total population) | 57.0% | |
| ■ 2001 | Slum population as percentage of urban population | 0% | |
| 1991 | Population female (% of total) | 55.6% | |
| 2003 | Age dependency ratio (dependents to working-age population) | | 0.64 |
| Indebtedness | | .. | |
| Independence date | | 1978 | |

| Committee for Development Policy LDC criteria | Inclusion | Graduation |
|---|---|---|
| Gap to threshold in % of current GNI per capita (US$) | 45.8% | 34.9% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current HAI score | 13.7% | 4.2% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current EVI score | -47.4% | -53.1% |

| MDGs progress | 1990-2000 |
|---|---|
| ■ MDG Hunger | .. |
| ■ MDG Primary education | .. |
| ■ MDG Gender equality in education | .. |
| ■ MDG Child mortality | .. |
| ■ MDG Access to water | .. |

## WELL-BEING

| Health | 1990 | 2003 |
|---|---|---|
| Life expectancy at birth (years, male and female combined) | .. | 61.0 |
| Fertility rate (births per woman) | .. | 2.8 |
| ■ Under five mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) | .. | 51 |
| | 1993-1998 | 1999-2004 |
| Physicians (per 1,000) | .. | .. |
| ■ Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total) | 99.0% | .. |

| Education | 2000-2004 | |
|---|---|---|
| Legal guarantee of primary free education | No legal guarantee | |
| Adult literacy (% of people ages 15 and above) | .. | |
| Youth literacy (% age 15-24) | .. | |
| Ratio of literate females to literate males (ages 15 and above) | .. | |
| Ratio of literate females to males (ages 15-24) | .. | |
| | 1999/2000 | 2002/2003 |
| ■ School enrolment primary (% gross) | 104%(a) | 102%(b) |
| Pupil-teacher ratio primary | .. | 25%(b) |
| School enrolment secondary (% gross) | 78%(a) | 84% |

| Public responsibility | 1999 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| Public expenditure on health (% of GDP) | .. | .. |
| General government expenditure on health (% of total government expenditure) | 3.6% | 1.5% |
| Out-of-pocket expenditure on health (% of total health expenditure) | 42.7% | 53.3% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of GDP) | .. | .. |
| Public expenditure on education (% of government expenditure) | .. | .. |
| Military expenditure (% of GDP) | .. | .. |
| Military expenditure (% of government final consumption) | .. | .. |
| Prison data and justice | 1990-1995 | 1996-2005 |
| Prison population rates (per 100,000) | 44 | 60 |
| 2005 Pre-trial detainees (% of prison population) | 0.0% | |

## ECONOMY

| Economic overview | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| HDI | .. | .. |
| GDP per capita (constant international US$ at PPP) | .. | .. |
| Gross domestic savings (% of GDP) | .. | .. |
| Gross fixed capital formation (% of GDP) | .. | .. |
| Net foreign direct investment inflows (as % of GDP) | .. | .. |
| Inflation consumer prices (annual %) | .. | .. |

| Economic overview (continued) | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| General government final consumption expenditure (% of GDP) | .. | .. |
| Agricultural labour force (% of total labour force) | 33%(c) | 25% |
| Military personnel (% of total labour force) | .. | .. |
| **Debt and aid** | | |
| External debt per capita (DOD constant 2000 US$) | .. | .. |
| ■ Debt service total (% of exports) | .. | .. |
| Aid per capita (constant 2000 US$) | .. | .. |
| Aid (% of GNI) | .. | .. |
| 2005 HIPC initiative (decision point/completion point) | .. | |
| **International trade** | | |
| Trade (% of GDP) | .. | .. |
| Food exports (% of merchandise exports) | .. | .. |
| Food imports (% of merchandise imports) | .. | .. |
| Manufactures exports (% of merchandise exports) | .. | .. |
| Manufactures imports (% of merchandise imports) | .. | .. |
| Fuel exports (% of merchandise exports) | .. | .. |
| Fuel imports (% of merchandise imports) | .. | .. |
| **Information and communication technology** | | |
| ■ Fixed line and mobile phone subscribers (per 1,000) | .. | .. |
| Television sets (per 1,000) | .. | .. |
| Total number of permanent post offices (per 100,000) | .. | |
| Daily newspapers (per 1,000) | .. | |
| **POVERTY AND INEQUALITY** | | |
| National Gini index | .. | |
| ■ Living on less than $1 a day (PPP) (% of population) | .. | |
| ■ Living on less than $2 a day (PPP) (% of population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at national poverty line (% of population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at rural poverty line (% of rural population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at urban poverty line (% of urban population) | .. | |
| HPI-1 rank – income poverty rank | .. | |
| HDI rank – GDI rank | .. | |
| **GOVERNANCE** | | |
| **Parliamentary development** | | |
| Lower or single house | Palamene o Tuvalu | |
| Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Lower or single house | 7/25/02 | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Parliamentary term in lower or single house (years) | 4 | |
| Parliamentarian obligation to declare personal assets | No | |
| **Participation** | | |
| 1981 Ratio of voters to registered voters (parliamentary) | 85.0% | |
| Ratio of voters to registered voters (presidential) | .. | |
| Year women received right to vote | 1967 | |
| Year women received right to stand for election | 1967 | |
| Parliamentary bodies dealing with human rights | .. | |
| **Aggregate indicators** | | |
| World Bank governance indicators | 1996 | 2004 |
| Voice and accountability | 1.3 | 0.9 |
| Political stability | .. | 0.9 |
| Government effectiveness | 1.3(d) | -0.8 |
| Regulatory quality | 0.4(d) | 0.8 |
| Rule of law | 1.5(d) | 0.8 |
| Control of corruption | -0.1(d) | -0.8 |
| **ENVIRONMENT** | **1990-1995** | **2000-2004** |
| ■ Proportion of land area covered by forest (%) | .. | .. |
| ■ Ratio of protected area to surface area | 0% | 110% |
| ■ Carbon dioxide emissions (metric tons per capita) | .. | .. |

Notes: (a) 1998/1999; (b) 2001/2002; (c) 1990; (d) 2000.

# Uganda

■ = MDG

## COUNTRY OVERVIEW

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2004 | Population (In millions) | 25.9 | |
| 2004 | Population density (per sq km) | 131.5 | |
| 2004 | Urban population (% of total population) | 12.4% | |
| ■ 2001 | Slum population as percentage of urban population | 93% | |
| 2004 | Population female (% of total) | 49.9% | |
| 2004 | Age dependency ratio (dependents to working-age population) | | 1.04 |
| Indebtedness | | Less indebted | |
| Independence date | | 1962 | |

| Committee for Development Policy LDC criteria | Inclusion | Graduation |
|---|---|---|
| Gap to threshold in % of current GNI per capita (US$) | -152.5% | -203.0% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current HAI score | -38.2% | -53.3% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current EVI score | -14.4% | -23.6% |

| MDGs progress | 1990-2000 |
|---|---|
| ■ MDG Hunger | Low progress |
| ■ MDG Primary education | Achieved |
| ■ MDG Gender equality in education | .. |
| ■ MDG Child mortality | Low progress |
| ■ MDG Access to water | Low progress |

## WELL-BEING

| Health | 1990 | 2003 |
|---|---|---|
| Life expectancy at birth (years, male and female combined) | 46.8 | 43.2 |
| Fertility rate (births per woman) | 7.0 | 6.0 |
| ■ Under five mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) | 160 | 140 |
| | 1993-1998 | 1999-2004 |
| Physicians (per 1,000) | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| ■ Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total) | 37.8% | 39.0% |

| Education | 2000-2004 | |
|---|---|---|
| Legal guarantee of primary free education | No legal guarantee | |
| Adult literacy (% of people ages 15 and above) | 68.9% | |
| Youth literacy (% age 15-24) | 80.2% | |
| Ratio of literate females to literate males (ages 15 and above) | 75.2% | |
| Ratio of literate females to males (ages 15-24) | 85.7% | |
| | 1999/2000 | 2002/2003 |
| ■ School enrolment primary (% gross) | 132% | 141% |
| Pupil-teacher ratio primary | 56% | 53% |
| School enrolment secondary (% gross) | 10% | 20% |

| Public responsibility | 1999 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| Public expenditure on health (% of GDP) | 1.9% | 2.1% |
| General government expenditure on health (% of total government expenditure) | 9.4% | 9.1% |
| Out-of-pocket expenditure on health (% of total health expenditure) | 42.7% | 37.7% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of GDP) | 2.5% | .. |
| Public expenditure on education (% of government expenditure) | .. | .. |
| Military expenditure (% of GDP) | 2.4% | 2.3% |
| Military expenditure (% of government final consumption) | 18.1% | 16.3% |
| Prison data and justice | 1990-1995 | 1996-2005 |
| Prison population rates (per 100,000) | 94 | 95 |
| 2005 Pre-trial detainees (% of prison population) | 58.0% | |

## ECONOMY

| Economic overview | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| HDI | 0.412 | 0.508 |
| GDP per capita (constant international US$ at PPP) | 1061.5 | 1440.0 |
| Gross domestic savings (% of GDP) | 7.4% | 7.9% |
| Gross fixed capital formation (% of GDP) | 15.7% | 21.3% |
| Net foreign direct investment inflows (as % of GDP) | 2.1% | 3.1% |
| Inflation consumer prices (annual %) | 8.6% | 3.3% |

| Economic overview (continued) | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| General government final consumption expenditure (% of GDP) | 9.8% | 15.7% |
| Agricultural labour force (% of total labour force) | 85%(a) | 79% |
| Military personnel (% of total labour force) | 0.5% | 0.5% |
| **Debt and aid** | | |
| External debt per capita (DOD constant 2000 US$) | 191.8 | 170.1 |
| ■ Debt service total (% of exports) | 19.8% | 7.1% |
| Aid per capita (constant 2000 US$) | 44.7 | 35.9 |
| Aid (% of GNI) | 14.7% | 15.6% |
| 2005 HIPC initiative (decision point/completion point) | Country has reached completion point | |
| **International trade** | | |
| Trade (% of GDP) | 32.6% | 41.1% |
| Food exports (% of merchandise exports) | 90.3% | 66.8% |
| Food imports (% of merchandise imports) | 15.8% | 16.2% |
| Manufactures exports (% of merchandise exports) | 4.4% | 9.4% |
| Manufactures imports (% of merchandise imports) | 77.8% | 66.7% |
| Fuel exports (% of merchandise exports) | 0.1% | 0.1% |
| Fuel imports (% of merchandise imports) | 1.7% | 13.7% |
| **Information and communication technology** | | |
| ■ Fixed line and mobile phone subscribers (per 1,000) | 2.1 | 32.7 |
| Television sets (per 1,000) | 7.3 | 15.8 |
| 2004 Total number of permanent post offices (per 100,000) | 1.3 | |
| 2000 Daily newspapers (per 1,000) | 2.7 | |
| **Poverty and inequality** | | |
| 1999 National Gini index | 43.0 | |
| ■ 1999 Living on less than $1 a day (PPP) (% of population) | .. | |
| ■ 1999 Living on less than $2 a day (PPP) (% of population) | .. | |
| 1997 Poverty rate at national poverty line (% of population) | 44.0% | |
| Poverty rate at rural poverty line (% of rural population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at urban poverty line (% of urban population) | .. | |
| HPI-1 rank – income poverty rank | .. | |
| HDI rank – GDI rank | 2 | |
| **GOVERNANCE** | | |
| **Parliamentary development** | | |
| Lower or single house | Parliament | |
| Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Lower or single house | 6/26/01 | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Parliamentary term in lower or single house (years) | 5 | |
| Parliamentarian obligation to declare personal assets | No | |
| **Participation** | | |
| 2001 Ratio of voters to registered voters (parliamentary) | 70.3% | |
| 2001 Ratio of voters to registered voters (presidential) | 70.3% | |
| Year women received right to vote | 1962 | |
| Year women received right to stand for election | 1962 | |
| Parliamentary bodies dealing with human rights | .. | |
| **Aggregate indicators** | | |
| World Bank governance indicators | 1996 | 2004 |
| Voice and accountability | -0.6 | -0.6 |
| Political stability | -1.2 | -1.3 |
| Government effectiveness | -0.4 | -0.4 |
| Regulatory quality | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Rule of law | -0.9 | -0.8 |
| Control of corruption | -0.5 | -0.7 |
| **ENVIRONMENT** | **1990-1995** | **2000-2004** |
| ■ Proportion of land area covered by forest (%) | 25.6% | 21.0% |
| ■ Ratio of protected area to surface area | 26% | 26% |
| ■ Carbon dioxide emissions (metric tons per capita) | 0.0 | 0.1 |

Notes: (a) 1990.

# United Republic of Tanzania

■ = MDG

## COUNTRY OVERVIEW

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2004 | Population (In millions) | 36.6 | |
| 2004 | Population density (per sq km) | 41.4 | |
| 2004 | Urban population (% of total population) | 36.5% | |
| ■ 2001 | Slum population as percentage of urban population | 92% | |
| 2004 | Population female (% of total) | 50.3% | |
| 2004 | Age dependency ratio (dependents to working-age population) | | 0.88 |
| Indebtedness | | Less indebted | |
| Independence date | | 1961 | |

| Committee for Development Policy LDC criteria | Inclusion | Graduation |
|---|---|---|
| Gap to threshold in % of current GNI per capita (US$) | -185.2% | -242.2% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current HAI score | -33.8% | -48.4% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current EVI score | 30.7% | 16.6% |

| MDGs progress | 1990-2000 |
|---|---|
| ■ MDG Hunger | Reversal/stagnation |
| ■ MDG Primary education | Reversal/stagnation |
| ■ MDG Gender equality in education | Achievable by 2015 |
| ■ MDG child mortality | Reversal/stagnation |
| ■ MDG Access to water | Achieved |

## WELL-BEING

| Health | 1990 | 2003 |
|---|---|---|
| Life expectancy at birth (years, male and female combined) | 50.1 | 42.7 |
| Fertility rate (births per woman) | 6.3 | 5.0 |
| ■ Under five mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) | 163 | 165 |
| | 1993-1998 | 1999-2004 |
| Physicians (per 1,000) | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| ■ Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total) | 38.2% | 35.8% |

| Education | 2000-2004 | |
|---|---|---|
| Legal guarantee of primary free education | Free education guaranteed | |
| Adult literacy (% of people ages 15 and above) | 69.4% | |
| Youth literacy (% age 15-24) | 78.4% | |
| Ratio of literate females to literate males (ages 15 and above) | 80.2% | |
| Ratio of literate females to males (ages 15-24) | 94.2% | |
| | 1999/2000 | 2002/2003 |
| ■ School enrolment primary (% gross) | 63% | 84% |
| Pupil-teacher ratio primary | 40% | 53% |
| School enrolment secondary (% gross) | 6% | .. |

| Public responsibility | 1999 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| Public expenditure on health (% of GDP) | 2.2% | 2.7% |
| General government expenditure on health (% of total government expenditure) | 14.8% | 14.9% |
| Out-of-pocket expenditure on health (% of total health expenditure) | 43.6% | 37.3% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of GDP) | 2.2%(a) | .. |
| Public expenditure on education (% of government expenditure) | .. | .. |
| Military expenditure (% of GDP) | 1.3%(b) | 2.1% |
| Military expenditure (% of government final consumption) | 15.6% | 24.1% |
| Prison data and justice | 1990-1995 | 1996-2005 |
| Prison population rates (per 100,000) | .. | 116 |
| 2004 Pre-trial detainees (% of prison population) | 49.0% | |

## ECONOMY

| Economic overview | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| HDI | 0.422 | 0.418 |
| GDP per capita (constant international US$ at PPP) | 485.9 | 611.9 |
| Gross domestic savings (% of GDP) | 1.9% | 9.5% |
| Gross fixed capital formation (% of GDP) | 19.6% | 19.0% |
| Net foreign direct investment inflows (as % of GDP) | 2.3% | 2.4% |
| Inflation consumer prices (annual %) | 28.4% | 4.1% |

| Economic overview (continued) | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| General government final consumption expenditure (% of GDP) | 11.5% | 13.4% |
| Agricultural labour force (% of total labour force) | 84%(c) | 80% |
| Military personnel (% of total labour force) | 0.2% | 0.2% |
| **Debt and aid** | | |
| External debt per capita (DOD constant 2000 US$) | 271.8 | 197.8 |
| ■ Debt service total (% of exports) | 17.9% | 5.1% |
| Aid per capita (constant 2000 US$) | 32.1 | 43.9 |
| Aid (% of GNI) | 17.1% | 16.3% |
| 2005 HIPC initiative (decision point/completion point) | Country has reached completion point | |
| **International trade** | | |
| Trade (% of GDP) | 59.3% | 45.6% |
| Food exports (% of merchandise exports) | 65.2%(b) | 59.0% |
| Food imports (% of merchandise imports) | 10.0% | 13.2% |
| Manufactures exports (% of merchandise exports) | 10.4%(b) | 18.1% |
| Manufactures imports (% of merchandise imports) | 84.4% | 65.5% |
| Fuel exports (% of merchandise exports) | 0.3%(b) | 2.0% |
| Fuel imports (% of merchandise imports) | 0.5% | 18.5% |
| **Information and communication technology** | | |
| ■ Fixed line and mobile phone subscribers (per 1,000) | 3.3 | 29.5 |
| Television sets (per 1,000) | 17.7 | 43.5 |
| 2004 Total number of permanent post offices (per 100,000) | 1.1 | |
| Daily newspapers (per 1,000) | .. | |
| **Poverty and inequality** | | |
| 2001 National Gini index | 36.7 | |
| ■ 1991 Living on less than $1 a day (PPP) (% of population) | 48.5% | |
| ■ 1991 Living on less than $2 a day (PPP) (% of population) | 72.5% | |
| 2001 Poverty rate at national poverty line (% of population) | 35.7% | |
| 2001 Poverty rate at rural poverty line (% of rural population) | 38.7% | |
| 2001 Poverty rate at urban poverty line (% of urban population) | 29.5% | |
| 2003 HPI-1 rank – income poverty rank | 5 | |
| 2003 HDI rank – GDI rank | 1 | |
| **GOVERNANCE** | | |
| **Parliamentary development** | | |
| Lower or single house | Bunge | |
| Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Lower or single house | 10/29/00 | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Parliamentary term in lower or single house (years) | 5 | |
| Parliamentarian obligation to declare personal assets | No | |
| **Participation** | | |
| 2000 Ratio of voters to registered voters (parliamentary) | 72.8% | |
| 2000 Ratio of voters to registered voters (presidential) | 84.4% | |
| Year women received right to vote | 1959 | |
| Year women received right to stand for election | 1959 | |
| Parliamentary bodies dealing with human rights | .. | |
| **Aggregate indicators** | | |
| World Bank governance indicators | 1996 | 2004 |
| Voice and accountability | -0.8 | -0.3 |
| Political stability | 0.0 | -0.4 |
| Government effectiveness | -1.2 | -0.4 |
| Regulatory quality | -0.5 | -0.5 |
| Rule of law | -0.7 | -0.5 |
| Control of corruption | -1.0 | -0.6 |
| **ENVIRONMENT** | **1990-1995** | **2000-2004** |
| ■ Proportion of land area covered by forest (%) | 45.0% | 43.9% |
| ■ Ratio of protected area to surface area | 38% | 38% |
| ■ Carbon dioxide emissions (metric tons per capita) | 0.1 | 0.1 |

Notes: (a) 1998/1999; (b) 1997; (c) 1990.

# Vanuatu

■ = MDG

## COUNTRY OVERVIEW

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2004 | Population (In millions) | 0.2 | |
| 2004 | Population density (per sq km) | 17.6 | |
| 2004 | Urban population (% of total population) | 23.3% | |
| ■ 2001 | Slum population as percentage of urban population | 37% | |
| 2004 | Population female (% of total) | 48.8% | |
| 2004 | Age dependency ratio (dependents to working-age population) | | 0.76 |
| Indebtedness | | Less indebted | |
| Independence date | | 1980 | |

| Committee for Development Policy LDC criteria | Inclusion | Graduation |
|---|---|---|
| Gap to threshold in % of current GNI per capita (US$) | 30.7% | 16.9% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current HAI score | 4.2% | -6.3% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current EVI score | -16.9% | -25.8% |

| MDGs progress | 1990-2000 |
|---|---|
| ■ MDG Hunger | .. |
| ■ MDG Primary education | Achieved |
| ■ MDG Gender equality in education | Achieved |
| ■ MDG Child mortality | Achievable by 2015 |
| ■ MDG Access to water | .. |

## WELL-BEING

| Health | 1990 | 2003 |
|---|---|---|
| Life expectancy at birth (years, male and female combined) | 64.5 | 68.7 |
| Fertility rate (births per woman) | 5.5 | 4.3 |
| ■ Under five mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) | 70 | 38 |
| | 1993-1998 | 1999-2004 |
| Physicians (per 1,000) | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| ■ Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total) | 89.1% | .. |

| Education | 2000-2004 | |
|---|---|---|
| Legal guarantee of primary free education | No legal guarantee | |
| 1999 Adult literacy (% of people ages 15 and above) | 74.0% | |
| Youth literacy (% age 15-24) | .. | |
| Ratio of literate females to literate males (ages 15 and above) | .. | |
| Ratio of literate females to males (ages 15-24) | .. | |
| | 1999/2000 | 2002/2003 |
| ■ School enrolment primary (% gross) | 109% | 113% |
| Pupil-teacher ratio primary | 22% | 29%(a) |
| School enrolment secondary (% gross) | 32% | 28% |

| Public responsibility | 1999 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| Public expenditure on health (% of GDP) | 2.7% | 2.8% |
| General government expenditure on health (% of total government expenditure) | 12.0% | 12.8% |
| Out-of-pocket expenditure on health (% of total health expenditure) | 13.5% | 12.1% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of GDP) | 7.1% | 6.3% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of government expenditure) | 17.4% | 28.6% |
| Military expenditure (% of GDP) | .. | .. |
| Military expenditure (% of government final consumption) | .. | .. |
| Prison data and justice | 1990-1995 | 1996-2005 |
| Prison population rates (per 100,000) | 53 | 51 |
| 2003 Pre-trial detainees (% of prison population) | 8.6% | |

## ECONOMY

| Economic overview | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| HDI | .. | 0.659 |
| GDP per capita (constant international US$ at PPP) | 3289.2 | 2678.0 |
| Gross domestic savings (% of GDP) | 14.3% | ..(b) |
| Gross fixed capital formation (% of GDP) | 23.8% | 20.2%(b) |
| Net foreign direct investment inflows (as % of GDP) | 13.6% | 6.9% |
| Inflation consumer prices (annual %) | 2.2% | 3.0% |

| Economic overview (continued) | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| General government final consumption expenditure (% of GDP) | 27.1% | 26.1%(b) |
| Agricultural labour force (% of total labour force) | 43%(c) | 35% |
| Military personnel (% of total labour force) | .. | .. |
| **Debt and aid** | | |
| External debt per capita (DOD constant 2000 US$) | 315.3 | 426.1 |
| ■ Debt service total (% of exports) | 1.2% | 1.4% |
| Aid per capita (constant 2000 US$) | 294.3 | 145.7 |
| Aid (% of GNI) | 21.0% | 12.3% |
| 2005 HIPC initiative (decision point/completion point) | .. | |
| **International trade** | | |
| Trade (% of GDP) | 100.6% | 107.4%(b) |
| Food exports (% of merchandise exports) | 75.2%(d) | 71.4% |
| Food imports (% of merchandise imports) | 20.4%(d) | 21.9%(e) |
| Manufactures exports (% of merchandise exports) | 10.7%(d) | 7.9%(e) |
| Manufactures imports (% of merchandise imports) | 69.3%(d) | 58.6%(e) |
| Fuel exports (% of merchandise exports) | .. | 0.0%(e) |
| Fuel imports (% of merchandise imports) | 6.8%(d) | 15.0%(e) |
| **Information and communication technology** | | |
| ■ Fixed line and mobile phone subscribers (per 1,000) | 25.9 | 69.0 |
| Television sets (per 1,000) | 10.7 | 13.0 |
| 2003 Total number of permanent post offices (per 100,000) | 15.7 | |
| Daily newspapers (per 1,000) | .. | |
| **Poverty and inequality** | | |
| National Gini index | .. | |
| ■ Living on less than $1 a day (PPP) (% of population) | .. | |
| ■ Living on less than $2 a day (PPP) (% of population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at national poverty line (% of population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at rural poverty line (% of rural population) | .. | |
| Poverty rate at urban poverty line (% of urban population) | .. | |
| HPI-1 rank – income poverty rank | .. | |
| HDI rank – GDI rank | .. | |
| **GOVERNANCE** | | |
| **Parliamentary development** | | |
| Lower or single house | Parliament | |
| Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Lower or single house | 7/6/04 | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Upper house or senate | .. | |
| Parliamentary term in lower or single house (years) | 4 | |
| Parliamentarian obligation to declare personal assets | No | |
| **Participation** | | |
| 1998 Ratio of voters to registered voters (parliamentary) | 39.9% | |
| Ratio of voters to registered voters (presidential) | .. | |
| Year women received right to vote | 1975, 1980(f) | |
| Year women received right to stand for election | 1975, 1980(f) | |
| Parliamentary bodies dealing with human rights | .. | |
| **Aggregate indicators** | | |
| World Bank governance indicators | 1996 | 2004 |
| Voice and accountability | 0.5 | 0.7 |
| Political stability | .. | 0.5 |
| Government effectiveness | -0.2 | -0.6 |
| Regulatory quality | -0.1 | -0.3 |
| Rule of law | -0.7(g) | -0.1 |
| Control of corruption | -0.3(g) | -0.5 |
| **ENVIRONMENT** | **1990-1995** | **2000-2004** |
| ■ Proportion of land area covered by forest (%) | 36.2% | 36.7% |
| ■ Ratio of protected area to surface area | 0% | 0% |
| ■ Carbon dioxide emissions (metric tons per capita) | 0.4 | 0.4 |

Notes: (a) 2001/2002; (b) 1999; (c) 1990; (d) 1994; (e) 2000; (f) reference to several dates reflects the stages in the granting of rights; (g) 1998.

# Yemen

■ = MDG

## COUNTRY OVERVIEW

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2004 | Population (In millions) | 19.8 | |
| 2004 | Population density (per sq km) | 37.4 | |
| 2004 | Urban population (% of total population) | 26.0% | |
| ■ 2001 | Slum population as percentage of urban population | 65% | |
| 2004 | Population female (% of total) | 49.1% | |
| 2004 | Age dependency ratio (dependents to working-age population) | | 0.90 |
| Indebtedness | | Less indebted(a) | |
| Independence date | | 1918, 1967 | |

| Committee for Development Policy LDC criteria | Inclusion | Graduation |
|---|---|---|
| Gap to threshold in % of current GNI per capita (US$) | -77.3% | -112.8% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current HAI score | -17.5% | -30.3% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current EVI score | -24.6% | -32.8% |

| MDGs progress | 1990-2000 |
|---|---|
| ■ MDG Hunger | Low progress |
| ■ MDG Primary education | .. |
| ■ MDG Gender equality in education | .. |
| ■ MDG Child mortality | Low progress |
| ■ MDG Access to water | .. |

## WELL-BEING

| Health | 1990 | 2003 |
|---|---|---|
| Life expectancy at birth (years, male and female combined) | 52.2 | 57.7 |
| Fertility rate (births per woman) | 7.5 | 6.0 |
| ■ Under five mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) | 142 | 113 |
| | 1993-1998 | 1999-2004 |
| Physicians (per 1,000) | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| ■ Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total) | 21.6% | .. |

| Education | 2000-2004 | |
|---|---|---|
| Legal guarantee of primary free education | Free education guaranteed | |
| Adult literacy (% of people ages 15 and above) | 49.0% | |
| Youth literacy (% age 15-24) | 67.9% | |
| Ratio of literate females to literate males (ages 15 and above) | 41.1% | |
| Ratio of literate females to males (ages 15-24) | 60.3% | |
| | 1999/2000 | 2002/2003 |
| ■ School enrolment primary (% gross) | 76% | 83% |
| Pupil-teacher ratio primary | 30%(b) | .. |
| School enrolment secondary (% gross) | 44% | 47% |

| Public responsibility | 1999 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| Public expenditure on health (% of GDP) | 1.4% | 1.0% |
| General government expenditure on health (% of total government expenditure) | 5.0% | 3.5% |
| Out-of-pocket expenditure on health (% of total health expenditure) | 57.4% | 62.5% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of GDP) | ..(c) | 9.5%(d) |
| Public expenditure on education (% of government expenditure) | .. | 32.8%(c) |
| Military expenditure (% of GDP) | 5.2% | 7.1% |
| Military expenditure (% of government final consumption) | 33.5% | 40.4% |
| Prison data and justice | 1990-1995 | 1996-2005 |
| Prison population rates (per 100,000) | .. | 83 |
| Pre-trial detainees (% of prison population) | .. | |

## ECONOMY

| Economic overview | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| HDI | 0.436 | 0.489 |
| GDP per capita (constant international US$ at PPP) | 753.2 | 822.0 |
| Gross domestic savings (% of GDP) | 14.6% | 9.3% |
| Gross fixed capital formation (% of GDP) | 20.6% | 16.4% |
| Net foreign direct investment inflows (as % of GDP) | -5.1% | -0.8% |
| Inflation consumer prices (annual %) | 55.1% | 10.8% |

| Economic overview (continued) | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| General government final consumption expenditure (% of GDP) | 14.4% | 13.1% |
| Agricultural labour force (% of total labour force) | 60%(e) | 48% |
| Military personnel (% of total labour force) | 1.5% | 2.4% |
| **Debt and aid** | | |
| External debt per capita (DOD constant 2000 US$) | 444.1 | 264.9 |
| ■ Debt service total (% of exports) | 3.1% | 3.1% |
| Aid per capita (constant 2000 US$) | 12.1 | 12.0 |
| Aid (% of GNI) | 4.6% | 2.4% |
| 2005 HIPC initiative (decision point/completion point) | .. | |
| **International trade** | | |
| Trade (% of GDP) | 108.8% | 63.6% |
| Food exports (% of merchandise exports) | 2.8% | 2.2% |
| Food imports (% of merchandise imports) | 28.9% | 35.6%(f) |
| Manufactures exports (% of merchandise exports) | 0.6% | 0.3%(f) |
| Manufactures imports (% of merchandise imports) | 59.4% | 48.7%(g) |
| Fuel exports (% of merchandise exports) | 95.3% | 96.9%(f) |
| Fuel imports (% of merchandise imports) | 7.9% | 12.0% |
| **Information and communication technology** | | |
| ■ Fixed line and mobile phone subscribers (per 1,000) | 12.7 | 48.9 |
| Television sets (per 1,000) | 273.3 | 307.8 |
| 2004 Total number of permanent post offices (per 100,000) | 1.3 | |
| Daily newspapers (per 1,000) | .. | |
| **Poverty and inequality** | | |
| 1998 National Gini index | 33.4 | |
| ■ 1998 Living on less than $1 a day (PPP) (% of population) | 15.7% | |
| ■ 1998 Living on less than $2 a day (PPP) (% of population) | 45.2% | |
| 1998 Poverty rate at national poverty line (% of population) | 41.8% | |
| 1998 Poverty rate at rural poverty line (% of rural population) | 45.0% | |
| 1998 Poverty rate at urban poverty line (% of urban population) | 30.8% | |
| 2003 HPI-1 rank – income poverty rank | 19 | |
| 2003 HDI rank – GDI rank | -4 | |
| **GOVERNANCE** | | |
| **Parliamentary development** | | |
| Lower or single house | Majlis Annowab | |
| Upper house or senate | Majlis Alshoora | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Lower or single house | 4/27/03 | |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Upper house or senate | 4/28/01 | |
| Parliamentary term in lower or single house (years) | 6 | |
| Parliamentarian obligation to declare personal assets | No | |
| **Participation** | | |
| 2003 Ratio of voters to registered voters (parliamentary) | 75.0% | |
| Ratio of voters to registered voters (presidential) | .. | |
| Year women received right to vote | 1967, 1970(h) | |
| Year women received right to stand for election | 1967, 1970(h) | |
| 1990 Parliamentary bodies dealing with human rights | Human Rights Committee | |
| **Aggregate indicators** | | |
| World Bank governance indicators | 1996 | 2004 |
| Voice and accountability | -0.9 | -1.0 |
| Political stability | -0.9 | -1.5 |
| Government effectiveness | -0.6 | -0.8 |
| Regulatory quality | -0.7 | -1.0 |
| Rule of law | -1.0 | -1.1 |
| Control of corruption | -0.2 | -0.8 |
| **ENVIRONMENT** | **1990-1995** | **2000-2004** |
| ■ Proportion of land area covered by forest (%) | 1.0% | 0.9% |
| ■ Ratio of protected area to surface area | .. | .. |
| ■ Carbon dioxide emissions (metric tons per capita) | 0.7 | 0.7 |

Notes: (a) 1918 for North Yemen and 1967 for South Yemen; (b) 1998/1999; (c) 2000/2001; (d) 2001/2002; (e) 1990; (f) 2000; (g) 2001; (h) 1967 for South Yemen and 1970 for North Yemen.

# Zambia

■ = MDG

| COUNTRY OVERVIEW | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2004 | Population (In millions) | 10.5 | |
| 2004 | Population density (per sq km) | 14.2 | |
| 2004 | Urban population (% of total population) | 36.2% | |
| ■ 2001 | Slum population as percentage of urban population | 74% | |
| 2004 | Population female (% of total) | 49.9% | |
| 2004 | Age dependency ratio (dependents to working-age population) | | 0.88 |
| Indebtedness | | Severely indebted | |

| Independence date | 1964 | |
|---|---|---|
| Committee for Development Policy LDC criteria | Inclusion | Graduation |
| Gap to threshold in % of current GNI per capita (US$) | -136.6% | -183.9% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current HAI score | -26.7% | -40.6% |
| Gap to threshold in % of current EVI score | -24.9% | -33.1% |

| MDGs progress | 1990-2000 |
|---|---|
| ■ MDG Hunger | Reversal/stagnation |
| ■ MDG Primary education | .. |
| ■ MDG Gender equality in education | Achieved |
| ■ MDG Child mortality | Reversal/stagnation |
| ■ MDG Access to water | Achievable by 2015 |

## WELL-BEING

| Health | 1990 | 2003 |
|---|---|---|
| Life expectancy at birth (years, male and female combined) | 49.1 | 36.5 |
| Fertility rate (births per woman) | 6.3 | 5.0 |
| ■ Under five mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) | 180 | 182 |
| | 1993-1998 | 1999-2004 |
| Physicians (per 1,000) | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| ■ Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total) | 46.5% | 43.4% |

| Education | 2000-2004 | |
|---|---|---|
| Legal guarantee of primary free education | No legal guarantee | |
| Adult literacy (% of people ages 15 and above) | 67.9% | |
| Youth literacy (% age 15-24) | 69.4% | |
| Ratio of literate females to literate males (ages 15 and above) | 78.4% | |
| Ratio of literate females to males (ages 15-24) | 91.2% | |
| | 1999/2000 | 2002/2003 |
| ■ School enrolment primary (% gross) | 79% | 82% |
| Pupil-teacher ratio primary | 47% | 43% |
| School enrolment secondary (% gross) | 20% | 28% |

| Public responsibility | 1999 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| Public expenditure on health (% of GDP) | 2.8% | 3.1% |
| General government expenditure on health (% of total government expenditure) | 9.9% | 11.3% |
| Out-of-pocket expenditure on health (% of total health expenditure) | 39.7% | 35.5% |
| Public expenditure on education (% of GDP) | 1.9% | 2.0%(a) |
| Public expenditure on education (% of government expenditure) | 17.6%(b) | .. |
| Military expenditure (% of GDP) | 1.0% | 0.6%(c) |
| Military expenditure (% of government final consumption) | 7.6% | 6.0%(c) |
| Prison data and justice | 1990-1995 | 1996-2005 |
| Prison population rates (per 100,000) | .. | 129 |
| 2003 Pre-trial detainees (% of prison population) | 38.6% | |

## ECONOMY

| Economic overview | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| HDI | 0.424 | 0.394 |
| GDP per capita (constant international US$ at PPP) | 770.6 | 851.7 |
| Gross domestic savings (% of GDP) | 12.2% | 18.9% |
| Gross fixed capital formation (% of GDP) | 12.4% | 23.3% |
| Net foreign direct investment inflows (as % of GDP) | 2.8% | 2.3% |
| Inflation consumer prices (annual %) | 34.9% | 22.2% |

| Economic overview (continued) | 1995 | 2002-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| General government final consumption expenditure (% of GDP) | 15.4% | 13.3% |
| Agricultural labour force (% of total labour force) | 74%(d) | 68% |
| Military personnel (% of total labour force) | 0.6% | 0.4% |
| **Debt and aid** | | |
| External debt per capita (DOD constant 2000 US$) | 851.9 | 583.4 |
| ■ Debt service total (% of exports) | 47.0%(e) | 29.6% |
| Aid per capita (constant 2000 US$) | 248.7 | 50.9 |
| Aid (% of GNI) | 62.9% | 13.4% |
| 2005 HIPC initiative (decision point/completion point) | Country has reached decision point | |
| **International trade** | | |
| Trade (% of GDP) | 75.8% | 48.5% |
| Food exports (% of merchandise exports) | 2.7% | 9.5% |
| Food imports (% of merchandise imports) | 9.8% | 13.9% |
| Manufactures exports (% of merchandise exports) | 7.0% | 13.6% |
| Manufactures imports (% of merchandise imports) | 72.3% | 75.1% |
| Fuel exports (% of merchandise exports) | 3.3% | 1.8% |
| Fuel imports (% of merchandise imports) | 13.2% | 7.1% |
| **Information and communication technology** | | |
| ■ Fixed line and mobile phone subscribers (per 1,000) | 8.8 | 29.4 |
| Television sets (per 1,000) | 43.7 | 61.7 |
| 2004 Total number of permanent post offices (per 100,000) | 1.8 | |
| 2000 Daily newspapers (per 1,000) | 21.9 | |
| **Poverty and inequality** | | |
| 1998 National Gini index | 52.6 | |
| ■ 1998 Living on less than $1 a day (PPP) (% of population) | 63.7% | |
| ■ 1998 Living on less than $2 a day (PPP) (% of population) | 87.4% | |
| 1998 Poverty rate at national poverty line (% of population) | 72.9% | |
| 1998 Poverty rate at rural poverty line (% of rural population) | 83.1% | |
| 1998 Poverty rate at urban poverty line (% of urban population) | 56.0% | |
| 2003 HPI-1 rank – income poverty rank | -6 | |
| 2003 HDI rank – GDI rank | 0 | |

**GOVERNANCE**

| Parliamentary development | |
|---|---|
| Lower or single house | National Assembly |
| Upper house or senate | .. |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Lower or single house | 12/27/01 |
| Most recent parliamentary election — Upper house or senate | .. |
| Parliamentary term in lower or single house (years) | 5 |
| Parliamentarian obligation to declare personal assets | Yes |
| **Participation** | |
| 1996 Ratio of voters to registered voters (parliamentary) | 78.5% |
| 1996 Ratio of voters to registered voters (presidential) | 55.5% |
| Year women received right to vote | 1962 |
| Year women received right to stand for election | 1962 |
| 1999 Parliamentary bodies dealing with human rights | Committee on Legal Affairs, Governance, Human Rights and Gender Matters |

| Aggregate indicators | | |
|---|---|---|
| World Bank governance indicators | 1996 | 2004 |
| Voice and accountability | -0.2 | -0.4 |
| Political stability | -0.4 | -0.2 |
| Government effectiveness | -0.9 | -0.8 |
| Regulatory quality | 0.3 | -0.5 |
| Rule of law | -0.3 | -0.5 |
| Control of corruption | -1.0 | -0.7 |

| ENVIRONMENT | 1990-1995 | 2000-2004 |
|---|---|---|
| ■ Proportion of land area covered by forest (%) | 53.5% | 42.0% |
| ■ Ratio of protected area to surface area | 41% | 41% |
| ■ Carbon dioxide emissions (metric tons per capita) | 0.2 | 0.2 |

Notes: (a) 2001/2002; (b) 1998/1999; (c) 2000; (d) 1990; (e) 1997.

# Statistics glossary

**Age dependency ratio**: The ratio of dependents — people younger than 15 and older than 64 — to the working-age population (those aged 15-64). For example, 0.7 means there are 7 dependents for every 10 working-age people.

**Agricultural labour force (% of total labour force):** The share of the agricultural labour force in the total labour force.

**Aid**: Includes both official development assistance (ODA) and official aid.

**Aid, net official:** Refers to aid flows (net of repayments) from official donors to countries and territories in part II of the DAC list of recipients: more advanced countries of Central and Eastern Europe, the countries of the former Soviet Union, and certain advanced developing countries and territories. (Official aid is provided under terms and conditions similar to those for ODA.) *See also Aid and ODA.*

**Bilateral pledges to the HIPC trust fund:** A firm obligation undertaken by an official donor to provide specified assistance to a trust fund for heavily indebted poor countries (HIPC). Bilateral commitments are recorded in the full amount of expected transfer, irrespective of the time required for the completion of disbursements.

**Births attended by skilled health personnel (% of total):** The percentage of deliveries attended by personnel (including doctors, nurses and midwives) trained to give the necessary care, supervision and advice to women during pregnancy, labour and the postpartum period; to conduct deliveries on their own; and to care for newborns.

**Carbon dioxide emissions:** Given in metric tons per capita, this refers to anthropogenic (human originated) carbon dioxide emissions stemming from the burning of fossil fuels, gas flaring and the production of cement. Emissions are calculated from data on the consumption of solid, liquid and gaseous fuels; gas flaring; and the production of cement.

**Children reaching grade 5:** The percentage of children starting primary school who eventually attain grade 5 (grade 4 if the duration of primary school is four years). These estimates are based on the reconstructed cohort method, which uses data on enrolment and repeaters for two consecutive years.

**Children under five years old who are short for their age (% of children under age 5):** The percentage of children under five years old who have a height-for-age below minus two standard deviations of the National Centre for Health Statistics NCHS/WHO reference median. Note: Children in this category are also termed "stunted."

**Children under five years old who are underweight for their age (% of children under age 5):** The percentage of children under five years old who have a weight-for-age below minus two standard deviations of the National Centre for Health Statistics NCHS/ WHO reference median.

**Combined gross enrolments ratio for primary, secondary and tertiary schools:** The number of students enrolled in primary, secondary and tertiary levels of education, regardless of age, as a percentage of the population of official school age for the three levels.

**Daily newspapers (per 1,000):** Daily newspapers are defined as those published at least four times a week. This measure is calculated as average circulation (or copies printed) per 1,000 people.

**Debt relief gross bilateral:** Forgiveness of bilateral debts of developing countries with the support of official funds of donors countries. Offsetting entries for official development assistant (ODA) principal are not subtracted.

**Debt total service:** The sum of principal repayments and interest actually paid in foreign currency, goods or services on long-term debt; interest paid on short-term debt; and repayments (repurchases and charges) to the IMF.

**Economic vulnerability index (EVI):** This index is calculated by the following components: (a) instability of export earnings; (b) instability of agricultural production; (c) population size; (d) share of manufacturing and modern services in GDP; and (e) merchandise export concentration. The index ranges from 0 to 100; the higher the score, the more vulnerable a country is to economic shocks.

**Education levels:** Categorized as pre-primary, primary, secondary or tertiary in accordance with the International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED). Pre-primary education (ISCED level 0) is provided at kindergartens and nursery and infant schools and is intended for children not old enough to enter school at the primary level. Primary education (ISCED level 1) provides the basic elements of education at establishments such as primary and elementary schools. Secondary education (ISCED levels 2 and 3) is based on at least four years of previous instruction at the first level and provides either general or specialized instruction, or both, at institutions such as middle schools, secondary schools, high schools, teacher training schools at this level and vocational or technical schools. Tertiary education (ISCED levels 5-7) refers to education at institutions such as universities, teachers colleges and higher-level professional schools — all of which require as a minimum condition of admission the successful completion of education at the second level or evidence of the attainment of an equivalent level of knowledge.

**Exports, manufactured:** Defined according to the Standard International Trade Classification (SITC) to include exports of chemicals, basic manufactures, machinery and transport equipment and other miscellaneous manufactured goods.

**External debt per capita:** This term, also known as debt outstanding and disbursed (DOD), refers to debt owed to non-residents repayable in foreign currency, goods or services. Total external debt is the sum of public, publicly guaranteed and private non-guaranteed long-term debt; use of IMF credit; and short-term debt. Short-term debt includes all debt having an original maturity of one year or less and interest in arrears on long-term debt. Data are in constant US$.

**Female economic activity:** The share of the female population aged 15 and above who supply, or are available to supply, labour for the production of goods and services.

**Female parliamentarians, senior officials and managers (% of total):** Women's share of positions defined according to the International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO-88) to include parliamentarians, senior government officials, traditional chiefs and heads of villages, senior officials of special interest organizations, corporate managers, directors and chief executives, production and operations department managers, and other department and general managers.

**Fertility rate, total:** The number of children who would be born to each woman if she were to live to the end of her child-bearing years and bear children at each age in accordance with prevailing age-specific fertility rates.

**Fixed line and mobile phone subscribers:** Fixed lines are telephone mainlines connecting a customer's equipment to public switched telephone networks. Mobile phone subscribers refer to users of portable telephones subscribing to an automatic public mobile telephone service using cellular technology that provides access to public switched telephone networks.

**Food:** Refers in this Report to the commodities in SITC sections 0 (food and live animals); 1 (beverages and tobacco); 4 (animal and vegetable oils and fats); and SITC division 22 (oil seeds, oil nuts, and oil kernels).

**Fuels :** Refers in this Report to SITC section 3 (mineral fuels).

**Gap to threshold in % of current EVI score:** Each LDC has a gap (negative or positive) with respect to the thresholds set by the Committee for Development Policy (CDP). The gap to threshold is the gap as a percent of current scores, and therefore indicates the country's situation for the given criteria — in this case, the EVI. A negative percentage means that the country is above the EVI threshold. Thus, if a country scores -100%, for example, then there are two distinct pieces of information: first, this country meets the criteria for being an LDC (the negative sign), and second, the size of the gap, which in this case exactly equals the size of its current EVI score.

**Gap to threshold in % of current GNI per capita (US$):** Each LDC has a gap (negative or positive) with respect to the thresholds set by the Committee for Development Policy (CDP). The gap to threshold is the gap as a percent of current scores, and therefore indicates the country's situation for the given criteria — in this case, GNI per capita. A negative percentage means that the country is below the threshold. Thus, if a country scores -100%, for example, then there are two distinct pieces of information: first, this country meets the criteria for being an LDC (the negative sign), and second, the size of the gap, which in this case exactly equals the size of its current GNI per capita.

**Gap to threshold in % of current HAI score:** Each LDC has a gap (negative or positive) with respect to the thresholds set by the Committee for Development Policy (CDP). The gap to threshold is the gap as a percent of current scores, and therefore indicates the country's situation for the given criteria — in this case, the HAI. A negative percentage means that the country is below the threshold. Thus, if a country scores -100%, for example, then there are two distinct pieces of information: first, this country meets the criteria for being an LDC (the negative sign), and second, the size of the gap, which in this case exactly equals the size of its current HAI score.

**GDP implicit deflator:** The ratio of GDP in current local currency to GDP in constant local currency. The base year varies by country.

**GDP per capita:** In this Report, GDP (gross domestic product) data are converted to international dollars using purchasing power parity (PPP) rates. According to this process, an international dollar has the same purchasing power over GDP as the US dollar has in the United States. GDP at purchaser prices is the sum of gross value added by all resident producers in the economy plus any product taxes and minus any subsidies not included in the value of the products. It is calculated without making deductions for depreciation of fabricated assets or for depletion and degradation of natural resources. Data are in constant 2000 international US$.

**Gender development index (GDI):** The GDI adjusts the HDI for discrepancies in the achievement of men and women regarding the HDI's three categories. Gender disparity is indicated when a country's GDI ranking is lower than its HDI ranking.

**General government final consumption expenditure (formerly general government consumption):** Includes all government current expenditures for purchases of goods and services (including compensation of employees). It also includes most expenditures on national defence and security, but excludes government military expenditures that are part of government capital formation.

**Gini index:** A measure of income/consumption inequality among households or individuals, usually calculated at a national level. A value of 0 represents perfect equality and a situation in which each member of society receives an equal share of income/consumption; a value of 100, or perfect inequality, is a society where one member receives all income and the rest get nothing. Only high quality/high coverage estimates were selected from WIDER.

**Gross domestic product (GDP):** The sum of value added by all resident producers in the economy plus any product taxes (less subsidies) not included in the valuation of output. GDP is calculated without making deductions for depreciation of fabricated capital assets or for depletion and degradation of natural resources. Value added is the net output of an industry after adding up all outputs and subtracting intermediate inputs.

**Gross domestic savings (% of GDP):** Gross domestic savings are calculated as GDP less final consumption expenditure (total consumption).

**Gross fixed capital formation (% of GDP):** Gross fixed capital formation (formerly gross domestic fixed investment) includes land improvements (fences, ditches, drains, and so on); plant, machinery, and equipment purchases; and the construction of infrastructure such as roads, railways, schools, offices, hospitals, private residential dwellings and commercial and industrial buildings. According to the 1993 SNA, net acquisitions of valuables are also considered capital formation.

**Gross national income (GNI, formerly GNP):** The sum of value added by all resident producers in the economy plus any product taxes (less subsidies) not included in the valuation of output plus net receipts of primary income (compensation of employees and property income) from abroad. Value added is the net output of an industry after adding up all outputs and subtracting intermediate inputs.

**Growth rates, multiyear:** Growth rates are expressed as average annual rates of change. In calculations of rates by the Human Development Report Office only the beginning and end points are used.

**Health expenditure per capita:** The sum of public and private expenditure (in PPP US$), divided by the population. Health expenditure includes the provision of health services (preventive and curative), family planning activities, nutrition activities and emergency aid designated for health — but excludes the provision of water and sanitation.

**Health expenditure, private:** Direct household (out of pocket) spending, private insurance, spending by non-profit institutions serving households and direct service payments by private corporations. Total health expenditure includes both private and public health expenditure.

**Health expenditure, public.** Current and capital spending from government (central and local) budgets; external borrowings and grants (including donations from international agencies and nongovernmental organizations); and social (or compulsory) health insurance funds. Total health expenditure includes both public and private health expenditure.

**HIPC completion point:** The date at which a country included in the HIPC (heavily indebted poor countries) initiative, a debt-reduction effort, successfully completes the key structural reforms agreed on at the HIPC decision point, including developing and implementing a poverty reduction strategy. The country then receives the bulk of its debt relief under the HIPC initiative without additional policy conditions.

**HIPC decision point:** The date at which a country commits, under the HIPC (heavily indebted poor countries) initiative, a debt-reduction effort, to undertake additional reforms and to develop and implement a poverty reduction strategy. Eligible countries must have an established track record of good performance under adjustment programmes supported by the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank.

**HIV prevalence:** The percentage of people in a given area, demographic group or population group who are infected with HIV. Adult HIV prevalence, the most commonly used overall statistic, refers to people aged 15-49.

**Human asset index (HAI):** The HAI uses four indicators: two for health and nutrition, and two for education. They include: (a) the average calorie consumption per capita as a percentage of the minimum requirement; (b) the under-five child mortality rate; (c) the gross secondary school enrolment ratio, and (d) the adult literacy rate. The HAI ranges from 0 to 100, with the higher score indicating "better" human achievement.

**Human development index (HDI):** A composite index measuring average achievement in three basic categories of human development: a long and healthy life, knowledge and a decent standard of living. Indicators used include life expectancy at birth, adult literacy rate, gross enrolment ratio and GDP per capita (PPP US$).

**Human poverty index–1 (HPI-1):** The HPI-1 for developing countries measures human deprivations in the same three human development categories as the HDI (longevity, knowledge and a decent standard of living). An HPI-1 of 0.25 implies that an average of 25% of people in the given country is affected by human poverty. The indicators included are: the probability at birth of not surviving to age 40; the percentage of adults who are illiterate; the percentage of people not having sustainable access to an improved water source; and the percentage of children below the age of five who are underweight. A country that ranks higher using income poverty indicators, and thus scores positive on the differences in rankings between the two indicators, has been more successful in reducing the number of people living below a pre-specified income poverty line than in reducing the number of people affected by the broad multidimensional definition of human poverty.

**Income share or consumption, shares of:** The shares of income or consumption accruing to subgroups of population indicated by deciles or quintiles, based on national household surveys covering various years. Because data come from surveys covering different years and using different methodologies, comparisons between countries must be made with caution.

**Indebtedness:** Severely indebted means that either or both of two key ratios are above critical levels. The two ratios are the present value of debt service to GNI (critical level of 80%) and the present value of debt service to exports (critical level of 220%). Moderately indebted means either or both of those ratios exceed 60% of, but do not reach, the critical levels. For economies that do not report detailed debt statistics to the World Bank Debtor Reporting System (DRS), present-value calculation is not possible. Instead, the following methodology is used to classify the non-DRS economies. Severely indebted means three of four key ratios (averaged over 2001-2003) are above critical levels; these ratios include debt to GNI (critical level of 50%); debt to exports (275%); debt service to exports (30%); and interest to exports (20%). Moderately indebted means three of the four key ratios exceed 60% of, but do not reach, the critical levels. All other classified low- and middle-income economies are listed as less indebted.

**Inflation:** As measured by the consumer price index, inflation reflects the annual percentage change in the cost to the average consumer of acquiring a fixed basket of goods and services. This basket may be fixed or changed at specified intervals, such as yearly.

**Internally displaced people (IDPs):** This term refers to persons or groups of persons who have been forced or obliged to flee or to leave their homes or places of habitual residence, in particular as a result of or in order to avoid the effects of armed conflict, situations of generalized violence, violations of human rights, or natural or human-made disasters — and who have not crossed an internationally recognized state border.

**Internet users:** People with access to the Internet.

**Legal guarantee of free primary education:** Countries are categorized by the criterion of the presence or absence of a legal guarantee of free education. Data are based on government reports under human rights treaties, and are thus authoritative. Such commitments are made in two main ways: either through a guarantee of free education for all school-aged children, or through government obligation to provide free education.

**Life expectancy (years, male and female combined):** The number of years a newborn infant would live if prevailing patterns of age-specific mortality rates at the time of birth were to stay the same throughout the child's life.

**Literacy rate, adult:** The percentage of people aged 15 and above who can, with understanding, both read and write a short, simple statement related to their everyday life.

**Literacy rate, youth:** The percentage of people aged 15-24 who can, with understanding, both read and write a short, simple statement related to their everyday life.

**Living on less than:** The percentage of the population living below specified poverty lines, notably the following:

- $1 a day — at 1985 international prices (equivalent to $1.08 at 1993 international prices), adjusted for purchasing power parity.
- $2 a day — at 1985 international prices (equivalent to $2.15 at 1993 international prices), adjusted for purchasing power parity.
- national poverty line — the poverty line deemed appropriate for a country by its authorities. National estimates are based on population weighted subgroup estimates from household surveys.

**Manufactures:** This term comprises commodities in SITC sections 5 (chemicals); 6 (basic manufactures); 7 (machinery and transport equipment); and 8 (miscellaneous manufactured goods). It excludes SITC division 68 (non-ferrous metals).

**Maternal mortality ratio (MMR):** The annual number of deaths of women from pregnancy-related causes, per 100,000 live births. With the participation of UNFPA, WHO and UNICEF have developed an approach to estimating maternal mortality that seeks to generate estimates for countries with no data and to correct available data for underreporting and misclassification. A dual strategy is used that involves adjusting nationally reported data using specific criteria and generating model-based estimates for countries with no data. The most significant change in 2000 was the approach used to take into account the impact of HIV-related mortality. The margins of uncertainty associated with the estimated MMRs are very large, and the estimates should not, therefore, be used to monitor trends in the short term. In addition, cross-country comparisons should be treated with considerable caution because different strategies are used to derive the estimates for different countries, making it difficult to draw comparisons.

**MDG selected targets:** The following Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) are directly considered in the Report's statistical information:

- Access to water: Halve, by 2015, the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking water and sanitation
- Child mortality: Reduce by two thirds, between 1990 and 2015, the under-five mortality rate
- Gender equality in education: Eliminate gender disparity in primary and secondary education, preferably by 2005, and in all levels of education no later than 2015
- Hunger: Halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people who suffer from hunger

*(explanation continues)*

- Primary education: Ensure that, by 2015, children everywhere, boys and girls alike, will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling

For methodology on country-level MDG progress calculations, please refer to UNCTAD (2004) and UNDP (2003b, 2005a).

**Military expenditure to education and health expenditure (% of GDP):** A key indicator derived from considering military expenditure in % of GDP for each GDP percentage point spent on education and health by the public sector: This index is calculated using the following formula for country *i* at time *t*:

$\varepsilon_{it}$ = (military expenditure % of GDP) / (public health expenditure % of GDP + public education expenditure % of GDP)

**Military expenditure:** All expenditures of the defence ministry and other ministries on recruiting and training military personnel as well as on construction and purchase of military supplies and equipment. Military assistance is included in the expenditures of the donor country.

**Military personnel:** This category includes all active duty military personnel, including paramilitary forces if those forces resemble regular units in their organization, equipment, training or mission. Military personnel comprise a percentage of the overall labour force, which consists of all people who meet the International Labour Organization's definition of economically active population.

**Natural disasters:** Includes droughts, earthquakes, extreme temperatures, floods, rock and mud slides, volcanic eruptions, wave surges, wildfires and wind storms.

**Net foreign direct investment:** Net inflows of investment to acquire a lasting management interest (10% or more of voting stock) in an enterprise operating in an economy other than that of the investor. Net foreign direct investment (FDI) is the sum of equity capital, reinvestment of earnings, other long-term capital, and short-term capital as shown in the balance of payments. The series in this Report's statistical tables shows net inflows in the reporting economy.

**ODA per capita of donor country:** Official development assistance (ODA) granted by a specific country divided by the donor country's total population.

**Official development assistance (ODA):** Net disbursements of loans made on concessional terms (net of repayments of principal) and grants by official agencies of the members of the OECD's Development Assistance Committee (DAC); by multilateral institutions; and by non-DAC countries. ODA is designed to promote economic development and welfare in countries and territories in part I of the DAC list of aid recipients. It includes loans with a grant element of at least 25% (calculated at a rate of discount of 10%).

**Out-of-pocket expenditure on health:** Refers to any direct outlay by households, including gratuities and in-kind payments, to health practitioners and suppliers of pharmaceuticals, therapeutic appliances, and other goods and services whose primary intent is to contribute to the restoration or enhancement of the health status of individuals or population groups. It is a part of private health expenditure.

**People affected by natural disasters:** Individuals who have been injured, affected and/or left homeless after a disaster are included in this category.

**Physicians:** Includes graduates of a faculty or school of medicine who are working in any medical field (including teaching, research and practice).

**Political groups:** A generic term designating all political entities that participate in an election and/or are represented in parliaments. These include political parties, coalitions, alliances, blocs, etc. Political groups reflect the various ways people come together to pursue common goals through parliamentary and government representation.

**Polity:** Political or governmental organization; a society or institution with an organized government; State; body politic.

**Polity transition, date of most recent:** The dates of the most recent polity transition of three or more points on the POLITY index scale. The scale's end date refers to the date when the previous polity regime ended, and its begin date lists the date of the beginning of the current regime.

**Population density (per sq km):** Population density is midyear population divided by land area in square kilometres.

**Population female (% of total):** The percentage of the total population that is female.

**Population total:** Refers to the de facto population, which includes all people actually present in a given area at a given time.

**Population urban/rural:** The midyear population of areas classified as urban/rural according to the criteria used by each country, as reported to the United Nations.

**Population using solid fuels (% of total):** Share of population that relies on biomass (wood, charcoal, crop residues and dung) and coal as the primary source of domestic energy for cooking and heating.

**Poverty rate at national/rural/urban:** *See Living on less than*

**PPP (purchasing power parity):** A rate of exchange that accounts for price differences across countries, allowing international comparisons of real output and incomes. At the PPP US$ rate (as used in this Report), PPP US$1 has the same purchasing power in the domestic economy as $1 has in the United States.

**Pre-trial detainees:** The percentage of individuals within the total prison population whose cases have not yet gone to trial.

**Primary school pupil-teacher ratio:** The number of pupils enrolled in primary school divided by the number of primary school teachers (regardless of their teaching assignment).

**Proportion of land area covered by forest area (%):** Land under natural or planted stands of trees, whether productive or not.

**Proportion of population with access to improved sanitation:** The percentage of the population with access to adequate excreta disposal facilities, such as a connection to a sewer or septic tank system, a pour-flush latrine, a simple pit latrine or a ventilated improved pit latrine. An excreta disposal system is considered adequate if it is private or shared (but not public) and if it can effectively prevent human, animal and insect contact with excreta.

**Proportion of population with sustainable access to improved water source:** The percentage of the population with reasonable access to any of the following types of water supply for drinking: household connections, public standpipes, boreholes, protected dug wells, protected springs and rainwater collection. Reasonable access is defined as the availability of at least 20 litres a person per day from a source within one kilometre of the user's dwelling.

**Protected land and water area:** Area of land and/or sea dedicated specifically to the protection and maintenance of biological diversity and of natural and associated cultural resources — and managed through legal or other effective means. Seven categories have been identified: 1) strict nature reserve (protected area managed mainly for science); 2) wilderness area (protected area managed mainly for wilderness preservation); 3) national park (protected area managed mainly for ecosystem preservation and recreation; 4) natural monument (protected area managed mainly for conservation of specific natural features); 5) habitat/species management area (protected area managed mainly for conservation through management intervention); 6) protected landscape/seascape (protected area managed mainly for landscape/seascape conservation and recreation); and 7) managed resource protected area (protected area managed mainly for the sustainable use of natural ecosystems).

**Public expenditure on education:** Includes both capital expenditures (spending on construction, renovation, major repairs and purchase of heavy equipment or vehicles) and current expenditures (spending on goods and services that are consumed within the current year and would need to be renewed the following year). It covers such expenditures as staff salaries and benefits, contracted or purchased services, books and teaching materials, welfare services, furniture and equipment, minor repairs, fuel, insurance, rents, telecommunications and travel.

**Public health expenditure:** Consists of recurrent and capital spending from government (central and local) budgets, external borrowings and grants (including donations from international agencies and NGOs), and social (or compulsory) health insurance funds.

**Quintile:** The portion of a frequency distribution containing one fifth of the total sample.

**Ratio of estimated female to male earned income:** The percentage of estimated earnings by women to those earned by men.

**Ratio of voters to registered voters:** The number of votes divided by the number of names on the voters' register, expressed as a percentage. Registration is the number of registered voters; this figure represents the number of names on the voters' register at the time that the registration process closes, as reported by the electoral management body.

**Ratio of young/adult literate females to males:** The percentage of females to males aged 15-24/15-49 who can, with understanding, read and write a short, simple statement on their everyday life.

**Refugees people:** Individuals who have fled their country because of a well-founded fear of persecution for reasons related to their race, religion, nationality, political opinion or membership in a particular social group — and who cannot or do not want to return. *Country of asylum* is the country in which a refugee has filed a claim of asylum but has not yet received a decision or is otherwise registered as an asylum seeker. *Country of origin* refers to the claimant's nationality or country of citizenship.

**School enrolment ratio, gross:** The number of students enrolled in a level of education, regardless of age, as a percentage of the population of official school age for that level. The gross enrolment ratio can be greater than 100% as a result of grade repetition and entry at ages younger or older than the typical age at that grade level.

**School enrolment ratio, net:** The number of students enrolled in a level of education who are of official school age for that level, as a percentage of the population of official school age for that level.

**Slum population:** A direct estimation of the number of slum dwellers is usually difficult if not impossible because of the lack of data based on a specific and operational definition. For this Report, estimates were obtained by starting with an attempt to measure "secure tenure," which is defined as "protection from involuntary removal from land or residence except through due legal process." Initial efforts, ultimately unsuccessful, focused on using tenure status data (owner, renter and squatter) as a proxy measure. UN-HABITAT then proposed that secure tenure would be demonstrated in household behaviour: Households with secure tenure would tend to have made more improvements than households without secure tenure, and this could be measured by a proxy index that included dwelling structure and amenities data. This measurement was seen as a subset of the UN-HABITAT slum index initiative that was already underway. The resulting secure tenure index provides a fair assessment of the magnitude of slum dwellings. The characteristic variables include: the proportion of households with access to water (within 200 meters); the proportion of permanent structures in the housing stock; the proportion of housing that is in compliance with local regulations; the proportion of households connected to a sewer; and the proportion of households connected to electricity.

**Standard international trade classification (SITC):** A statistical classification of the commodities entering external trade, SITC is designed to provide the commodity aggregates needed for purposes of economic analysis and to facilitate the international comparison of trade-by-commodity data.

**Status index:** *See transformation index*

**Surface (sq km):** A country's total area, excluding area under inland water bodies, national claims to continental shelf, and exclusive economic zones. In most cases the definition of inland water bodies includes major rivers and lakes.

**Television sets:** Refers to those in use, per 1,000 people.

**Trade:** The sum of exports and imports of goods and services measured as a share of gross domestic product (GDP).

**Transformation index:** Also known as the status index, this indicates the progress that states have made toward democracy and a market economy. States with functioning democratic and market-based structures receive the highest scores. The index's overall result represents the mean value of the scores for the categories "political transformation" — i.e., democratic development — and "economic transformation" (i.e., economic development). The mean value was calculated using the exact, unrounded values for both of these categories, which, in turn, were derived from the ratings for five political criteria (based on 18 indicators) and seven economic criteria (based on 14 indicators).

**Under-five mortality rate:** The probability of dying between birth and exactly five years of age, expressed per 1,000 live births.

**Women and other quotas:** Refers to quotas established by law for women and other categories (in parliaments, political parties and government)

**Women in government at ministerial level:** Defined according to each State's definition of a national executive and may include women serving as ministers and vice ministers and those holding other ministerial positions, including parliamentary secretaries.

**Women in parliament (% of total):** Refers to seats held by women in a lower or single house or an upper house or senate, where relevant.

**World Bank governance indicators:** The lower the score, the worse off a country is in terms of governance.

- *Voice and accountability* includes a number of indicators measuring various aspects of the political process, civil liberties, and political and human rights — and also measures the extent to which citizens of a country are able to participate in the selection of governments.

- *Political stability and absence of violence* combines several indicators that measure perceptions of the likelihood that the government in power will be destabilized or overthrown by possibly unconstitutional and/or violent means, including domestic violence and terrorism.

- *Government effectiveness* combines responses on the quality of public service provision, the quality of the bureaucracy, the competence of civil servants, the independence of the civil service from political pressures, and the credibility of the government's commitment to policies.

- *Regulatory quality* focuses on government policies themselves, including measures of the incidence of market-unfriendly policies such as price controls or inadequate bank supervision. It also considers perceptions of the burdens imposed by excessive regulation in areas such as foreign trade and business development.

- *Rule of law* includes several indicators that measure the extent to which agents have confidence in and abide by the rules of society. These include perceptions of the incidence of crime, the effectiveness and predictability of the judiciary, and the enforceability of contracts.

- *Control of corruption* is a measure of the extent of corruption, conventionally defined as the exercise of public power for private gain. It is based on scores of variables from polls of experts and surveys.

**Year women received right to stand for election:** The date signifies the year women were granted the right to stand for election.

**Year women received right to vote:** The date signifies the year women were granted the right to vote.

# Indicators source

**Age dependency ratio (dependents to working-age population):** World Bank (2005a) WHO (2005a)

**Agricultural labour force (% of total labour force):** UNCTAD (2004)

**Aid (% of GNI):** World Bank (2005a)

**Aid per capita (constant US$):** World Bank (2005a)

**Annual GDP per capita growth rate (% 1990-2003):** UNDP (2005a)

**Annual population growth rate (%) 2003-2015:** UNDP (2005a)

**Bilateral pledges to the HIPC trust fund (US$ millions):** UNDP (2005a)

**Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total):** World Bank (2005a) WHO (2005b)

**Capital:** UN-OHRLLS (2005)

**Carbon dioxide emissions (metric tons per capita) :** UN (2005) UN (2003)

**Children reaching grade 5 (% of grade 1 students):** UNDP (2005a)

**Children under five years old who are short for their age (% of children under age 5):** WHO (2005b)

**Children under five years old who are underweight for their age (% of children under age 5):** WHO (2005b)

**Combined gross enrolments ratio for primary, secondary and tertiary schools:** UNDP (2005a)

**Daily newspapers (per 1,000):** World Bank (2005a)

**Debt relief gross bilateral debt forgiveness (US$ millions):** UNDP (2005a)

**Debt services total (% of exports):** World Bank (2005a)

**Economic vulnerability index (EVI):** UN (2004a)

**External debt per capita (DOD constant US$):** World Bank (2005a)

**Female economic activity (% of male rate) (1990 = 100):** UNDP (2005a)

**Female economic activity rate index (1990 = 100):** UNDP (2005a)

**Female legislators, senior officials and managers (% of total):** UNDP (2005a)

**Fertility rate, total (births per woman):** World Bank (2005a) WHO (2005a)

**Fixed line and mobile phone subscribers (per 1,000):** World Bank (2005a)

**Food exports (% of merchandise exports):** World Bank (2005a)

**Food imports (% of merchandise imports):** World Bank (2005a)

**Fuel exports (% of merchandise exports):** World Bank (2005a)

**Fuel imports (% of merchandise imports):** World Bank (2005a)

**Gap to threshold in % of current EVI score:** UN (2004a)

**Gap to threshold in % of current GNI per capita (US$):** UN (2004a)

**Gap to threshold in % of current HAI score:** UN (2004a)

**GDP implicit deflator:** World Bank (2005a)

**GDP per capita (constant international US$ at PPP):** World Bank (2005a)

**GDP per capita annual growth rate (%):** UNDP (2005a)

**General government expenditure on health (% of total government expenditure):** WHO (2005a)

**General government final consumption expenditure (% of GDP):** World Bank (2005a)

**GNI per capita:** UN (2004a)

**Gross domestic savings (% of GDP):** World Bank (2005a)

**Gross fixed capital formation (% of GDP):** World Bank (2005a)

**Human assets index (HAI):** UN (2004a)

**Human development index (HDI):** UNDP (2005a)

**HDI rank — GDI rank:** UNDP (2005a)

**HIPC initiative (decision point/completion point) :** UN (2005)

**HIV prevalence (adults % of age 15-49):** World Bank (2005a) UNDP (2005a)

**HPI-1 rank — income poverty rank:** UNDP (2005a)

**Income or consumption share of:** World Bank (2005a) WIDER (2005)

**Indebtedness:** World Bank (2005a)

**Independence date:** UN-OHRLLS (2005)

**Inflation, consumer prices (annual %):** World Bank (2005a)

**Internally displaced people:** IDP (2005)

**Internet users (per 1,000):** World Bank (2005a)

**Legal guarantee of free primary education:** Tomasevski (2003)

**Life expectancy (years, male and female combined):** World Bank (2005a) WHO (2005a)

**Literacy (% age 15-24):** UNESCO (2005)

**Literacy (% age 15 and above):** UNESCO (2005)

**Living on less than $1 a day (PPP) (% of population):** World Bank (2005a)

**Living on less than $2 a day (PPP) (% of population):** World Bank (2005a)

**Lower or single house:** IPU (2005a)

**Manufactures exports (% of merchandise exports):** World Bank (2005a)

**Manufactures imports (% of merchandise imports):** World Bank (2005a)

**Maternal mortality ratio adjusted (per 100,000 live births):** UN (2005) World Bank (2005a)

**MDG access to water:** UNCTAD (2004)

**MDG child mortality:** UNCTAD (2004)

**MDG gender equality in education:** UNCTAD (2004)

**MDG hunger:** UNCTAD (2004)

**MDG primary education:** UNCTAD (2004)

**Military expenditure (% of GDP):** SIPRI (2005a)

**Military expenditure to education and health expenditure (% of GDP):** World Bank (2005a)

**Military expenditure (% of central government expenditure):** World Bank (2005a) SIPRI (2005b)

**Military personnel (% of total labour force):** World Bank (2005a)

**Most recent parliamentary election — lower or single house:** IPU (2005a)

**Most recent parliamentary election — upper house or senate:** IPU (2005a)

**National Gini index:** World Bank (2005a) WIDER (2005)

**Net foreign direct investment inflows (as % of GDP):** World Bank (2005a)

**Number of political parties with seats in the parliament listed by the International Organization of Parliaments of Sovereign States (IPU):** IPU (2005a)

**Official development assistance per capita of donor country (2002 US$):** UNDP (2005a)

**Official development assistance to LDCs (% of total):** UNDP (2005a)

**Out-of-pocket expenditure as % of total health expenditure:** WHO (2005a)

**Parliamentary elections listed by the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA) (various initial years):** IDEA (2005a)

**Parliamentary structure:** IPU (2005a)

**Parliamentary term in lower or single house (years):** IPU (2005a)

**Parliamentarian obligation to declare personal assets:** IPU (2005a)

**Parliamentarian bodies dealing with human rights:** IPU (2005d)

**People affected by natural disasters:** GEO-3 (2005)

**Physicians (per 1,000):** World Bank (2005a)

**Polity IV score:** Gurr et al (2003)

**Population (in millions):** UN-OHRLLS (2005) World Bank (2005a)

**Population density (per sq km):** UN (2004b) World Bank (2005a)

**Population female (% of total):** UN (2004b) UN (2003) World Bank (2005a)

**Poverty rate at national poverty line (% of population):** World Bank (2005a)

**Poverty rate at rural poverty line (% of rural population):** World Bank (2005a)

**Poverty rate at urban poverty line (% of urban population):** World Bank (2005a)

**Pre-trial detainees (% of prison population):** ICPS (2005)

**Proportion of land area covered by forest (%):** UN (2005)

**Proportion of population with access to improved sanitation:** UN (2005), UNDP (2005a)

**Proportion of population with sustainable access to an improved water source:** UN (2005), UNDP (2005a)

**Prison population rates (per 100,000 people):** ICPS (2005)

**Proportion of land area covered by forest (%):** UN (2005)

**Public expenditure on education (% of government expenditure):** World Bank (2005a) UNESCO (2005)

**Public expenditure on education (% of GDP):** UNESCO (2005)

**Public expenditure on health (% of GDP):** World Bank (2005a)

**General government expenditure on health (% of total government expenditure):** WHO (2005a)

**Pupil-teacher ratio, primary:** UNESCO (2005)

**Quotas (in parliament, political parties and government) legally mandated for women and other categories:** IDEA (2005b), Htun (2004)

**Ratio of estimated female to male earned income:** UNDP (2005a)

**Ratio of female to male gross primary school enrolment (%):** UNESCO (2005), World Bank (2005a)

**Ratio of literate females to literate males (ages 15 and above):** UNESCO (2005), World Bank (2005a)

**Ratio of literate females to males (ages 15-24):** UNESCO (2005)

**Ratio of protected area to surface area:** UN (2005)

**Ratio of voter to registered voters (parliament):** IDEA (2005a)

**Ratio of voters to registered voters (presidential):** IDEA (2005a)

**Refugees country of asylum:** UNHCR (2005)

**Refugees country of origin:** UNHCR (2005)

**School enrolment, primary (% gross):** UNESCO (2005)

**School enrolment, primary (% net):** UNESCO (2005), World Bank (2005a)

**School enrolment, secondary (% gross):** UNESCO (2005)

**Slum population as percentage of urban population:** UN (2005)

**Status index:** Bertelsmann (2005)

**Surface (sq km):** World Bank (2005a), UN-OHRLLS (2005)

**Television sets (per 1,000):** World Bank (2005a)

**Total number of permanent post offices (per 100,000 people):** UPU (2005), World Bank (2005a)

**Trade (% of GDP):** World Bank (2005a)

**Trade goods imports from LDCs share of total imports (%):** UNDP (2005a)

**Trade goods imports from LDCs total (US$ millions):** UNDP (2005a)

**Treaties:** UNDP (2005a), UNODC (2005)

**Under five mortality rate (per 1,000 live births):** World Bank (2005a), WHO (2005a)

**Upper house or senate:** IPU (2005a)

**Urban population (% of total population):** UN (2004b), World Bank (2005a)

**Women in government at ministerial level (% of total):** UNDP (2005a)

**Women in parliaments (% of total):** IPU (2005c), UNDP (2005a)

**World Bank governance indicators:** World Bank (2005b)

**Year women received right to stand for election:** IPU (2005b)

**Year women received right to vote:** IPU (2005b)

# Statistical references

Bertelsmann Stiftung. 2004. "Bertelsmann Transformation Index 2003: Political Management in International Comparisons." Gütersloh, Germany: Bertelsmann Stiftung Online: www.bertelsmann-transformation-index.de/11.0.html?&L=1.

———. 2005. "Status Index 2006." Gütersloh, Germany: Bertelsmann Stiftung. Online: http://en.bertelsmann-stiftung.de/index.html.

Besançon, Marie. 2003. "Good Governance Rankings: The Art of Measurement." Cambridge, USA: World Peace Foundation, John F. Kennedy School of Government.

Bovaird, Tony and Elke Loffler. 2003. "Evaluating the Quality of Public Governance: Indicators, Models and Methodologies." *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 69(3):311-312.

Court, Julius, Goran Hyden and Ken Mease. 2002. "Assessing Governance: Methodological Challenges." United Nations University.

Goldstone, Jack, Ted R. Gurr, Barbara Harff, Marc A. Levy, Monty G. Marshall, Robert H. Bates, David L. Epstein, Colin H. Kahl, Pamela T. Surko, John C. Ulfeder and Alan N. Unger. 2002. "State Failure Task Force Report: Phase III Findings." College Park, USA: University of Maryland.

Guillaumont, Patrick, Olav Bjerkholt, Jayendra Nayak, Milivoje Paniae, Suchitra Punyaratabandhy, and Funmi Togonu-Bickersteth. 2003. "Report of the Expert Group Meeting on the Review of the List of Least Developed Countries." New York, USA: CDP (Committee for Development Policy).

Guillaumont, Patrick. 2004. "A Revised EVI." New York, USA: CDP (Committee for Development Policy.

Guillaumont, Patrick, Olav Bjerkholt, Albert Binger, Suchitra Punyaratabandhy and Kerfalla Yansane. 2005. Expert Group Meeting on Improving Criteria for the Identification of Least Developed Countries. New York, USA: CDP (Committee for Development Policy).

Gurr, Ted R., Monty G Marshall and Keith Jaggers. 2003. *Polity IV Project Political Regime Characteristics and Transitions 1800-2003.* College Park, USA: University of Maryland. Online: www.cidcm.umd.edu/inscr/polity/.

Hauserman, Julia, and Todd Landman. 2003. "Map-Making and Analysis of the Main International Initiatives on Developing Indicators on Democracy and Good Governance." Colchester, UK: University of Essex, Human Rights Centre.

Htun, Mala. 2004. "Is Gender Like Ethnicity? The Political Representation of Identity Groups." *Perspectives in Politics* 2(3):439-458.

ICPS (International Centre for Prison Studies). 2005. "Prison Briefs — Highest to Lowest Rates." London, UK: King's College. Online: www.kcl.ac.uk/depsta/rel/icps/worldbrief/highest_to_lowest_rates.html.

IDEA (International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance). 2004. *Voter Turnout Website.* Stockholm, Sweden: International IDEA. Online: www.idea.int/vt/.

IDEA (International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance) and Stockholm University. 2005. *Global Database of Quotas for Women.* Stockholm, Sweden: International IDEA. Online: www.quotaproject.org/index.cfm.

IDP (Global Internal Displaced Person Project). 2005. *Internal Displaced Persons (IDP)*. Global Internal Displaced Person (IDP) Project. Online: www.idpproject.org/statistics.htm.

IPU (Inter-Parliamentary Union). 2005a. "Parline Database." Geneva, Switzerland: IPU. Online: www.ipu.org/parline-e/parlinesearch.asp.

———. 2005b. "Women's Suffrage: A World Chronology of the Recognition of Women's Rights to Vote and to Stand for Election." Geneva, Switzerland: IPU. Online: www.ipu.org/wmn-e/suffrage.htm.

———. 2005c. "Women in National Parliaments." Geneva, Switzerland: IPU. Online: www.ipu.org/wmn-e/classif.htm.

———. 2005d. "Specialized Parliamentary Bodies." Geneva, Switzerland: IPU. Online: www.ipu.org/parline-e/Instanceadvanced.asp.

Jabes, Jak. 2002. "On the (f)utility of Governance Indicators: Lessons from Countries in Transition." Asian Development Bank.

Jonas, Olga B. 2004. "The Sixth Session of the Committee for Development Policy." New York, USA: CDP (Committee for Development Policy).

Kaufmann, Daniel, Francesca Recanatini and Sergiy Biletsky. 2002. "Assessing Governance: Diagnostic Tools and Applied Methods for Capacity Building and Action Learning." Washington, USA: World Bank.

Kaufmann, Daniel. 2004a. "Governance Redux: The Empirical Challenge." Washington, USA: World Bank.

———. 2005b. "Corruption, Governance and Security for the Rich Countries and the World." Washington, USA: World Bank.

———. 2005. "Rethinking Governance: Empirical Lessons Challenge Orthodoxy." Economics Working Papers, Economics Working Papers Archive. Washington, USA.

Keefer, Philip. 2004. "A Review of the Political Economy of Governance: From Property Rights to Voice." Washington, USA: World Bank.

Knack, Stephen, Mark Kugler and Nick Manning. 2003. "Second-Generation Governance Indicators." *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 69(3):345-364.

Lambsdorff, Johann. 2001. "Background Paper to the 2001 Corruption Perceptions Index." Berlin, Germany: Transparency International.

Landman, Todd. 2004. "Measuring Human Rights: Principle, Practice, and Policy." *Human Rights Quarterly* (26):906-931.

Malik, Adeel. 2002. "State of the Art in Governance Indicators." New York, USA: UNDP (United Nations Development Programme).

———. 2005. "Democracy and Development: A Review of the Statistical Evidence." Oxford, UK: St Peter´s College Oxford.

Marshall, Monty G, and Keith Jaggers. 2005. *Political Regime Characteristics and Transitions, 1800-2002.* College Park, USA: University of Maryland.

Ndegwa, Stephen N. 2001. "Governance, Peace and Social Stability." New York, USA: UNDP (United Nations Development Programme).

Nzongola-Ntalaja, Georges. 2005. "Democracy Assessment and Indicators." Oslo, Norway: UNDP Oslo Governance Center.

Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat. 2003. "Environmental Vulnerability Index." Majuro, Marshall Islands: Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat.

Sano, Hans-Otto and Lone Lindholt. 2005. "Human Rights Indicators: Country Data and Methodology 2000." Copenhagen, Denmark: The Danish Institute for Human Rights.

SIPRI (Stockholm International Peace Research Institute). 2005a. *SIPRI Military Expenditure Database.* Stockholm, Sweden: SIPRI. Online: www.sipri.org/contents/milap/milex/mex_database1.html.

———. 2005b. "Correspondence on Military Expenditure Data in Constant US$m at 2000 Prices and Exchange Rates." Stockholm, Sweden: SIPRI.

Tomasevski, Katarina. 2003. "School Fees as Hindrance to Universalizing Primary Education." Paris, France: UNESCO EFA (Education for all).

UN-OHRLLS (United Nations Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States). 2003a. *List of Least Developed Countries.* New York, USA: UN-OHRLLS. Online: www.un.org/special-rep/ohrlls/ldc/list.htm.

———. 2003b. "Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries: An Update." Bangkok, Thailand: UN-OHRLLS.

UN (United Nations). 2000. "Committee for Development Policy's Economic Vulnerability Index Explanatory Note.".New York, USA: CDP (Committee for Development Policy).

———. 2002. "Data Used in the Three Criteria for the Identification of the Least Developed Countries." New York, USA: CDP (Committee for Development Policy).

———. 2003. "World Statistics Pocketbook Least Developed Countries 2003." New York, USA: UN DESA (United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs). Online: http://unstats.un.org/unsd/pubs/gesgrid.asp?mysearch=pocketbook.

———. 2004a. "The Current List of Least Developed Countries: Key Indicators." New York, USA: UN DESA (United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs).

———. 2004b. *World Population Prospects: The 2004 Revision.* New York, USA: UN DESA (United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs). Online: http://esa.un.org/unpp/.

———. 2004c. "Poverty Reduction and Good Governance." New York, USA: UN DESA (United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs).

———. 2004d. "Report on the Sixth Session (29 March _ 2 April 2004), Official Records 2004, Supplement 13." New York, USA: CDP (Committee for Development Policy).

———. 2005a. "Millennium Indicators Database." New York, USA: UNSD. Online: http://unstats.un.org/unsd/mi/mi_goals.asp.

———. 2005b."Expert Meeting on Improving the Criteria for the Identification of Least Developed Countries." New York, USA: UN DESA (United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs) and CDP (Committee for Development Policy).

UN ECA (United Nations Economic Commission for Africa). 2005. "Striving for Good Governance in Africa." Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: UN ECA.

UN OHCHR (United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights). 2000. "Human Rights in Development: What, Why and How." Geneva, Switzerland: UN OHCHR.

———. 2001. "Human Rights, Poverty and Governance in the Least Developed Countries: Rights-based Approaches towards a New Framework of Cooperation." Brussels, Belgium: United Nations.

UNCTAD (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development). 2004. "The Least Developed Countries Report: Linking International Trade with Poverty Reduction." Geneva, Switzerland; UNCTAD.

UNDP (United Nations Development Programme). 2002. "Human Development Report 2002: Deepening Democracy in a Fragmented World." New York, USA: UNDP.

———. 2003a. "Sources for Democratic Governance Indicators." Oslo, Norway: UNDP.

———. 2003b. "Human Development Report 2003: Millennium Development Goals: A Compact among Nations to End Human Poverty." New York, USA: UNDP.

UNDP (United Nations Development Programme) and Nadia Hijab. 2003. "Human Rights-Based Reviews of UNDP Programmes: Working Guidelines." New York, USA: UNDP.

UNDP (United Nations Development Programme), and European Commission. 2004. "Governance Indicators: A Users' Guide." Oslo, Norway: UNDP Oslo Governance Centre.

UNDP (United Nations Development Programme). 2004. "Human Development Report 2004: Cultural Liberty in Today's Diverse World." New York, USA: UNDP.

———. 2005a. "National HDRs and the Use of Governance Indicators for Pro-Poor and Gender-Sensitive Policy Reform." New Delhi, India: UNDP.

———. 2005b. "Human Development Report 2005: International Cooperation at a Crossroads: Aid, Trade and Security in an Unequal World." New York, USA: UNDP.

———. 2005c. "Using Governance Indicators to Measure Human Development." New York, USA: UNDP.

UNEP (United Nations Environment Programme). 2002. "GEO-3 Data Compendium." London, UK: Earthscan Publications. Online: http://geocompendium.grid.unep.ch/data_sets/index_nat_dataset.htm.

UNESCO (United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization. 2005. *Education Statistics.* Montreal, Canada: UNESCO. Online: www.uis.unesco.org/ev.php?URL_ID=5187&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.

UNHCR (Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees). 2004. *2004 Global Refugee Trends: Overview of Refugee Populations, New Arrivals, Durable Solutions, Asylum-Seekers, Stateless and Other Persons of Concern to UNHCR.* Geneva, Switzerland: UNHCR. Online: www.unhcr.ch/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/statistics.

———. 2005. Correspondence on refugees data. Geneva, Switzerland; UNHCR.

UNODC (United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime). 2005. *United Nations Convention against Corruption.* Vienna, Austria: UNODC. Online: www.unodc.org/unodc/en/crime_signatures_corruption.html?print=yes.

UPU (Universal Postal Union). 2005. *Query the Postal Statistics Data Base.* Bern, Switzerland: UPU. Online: www.upu.int/pls/ap/ssp_report.main?p_language=AN&p_choice=BROWSE.

US Census Bureau. 2005. "Description of the Foreign Trade Statistics Program Merchandise Trade Statistics." Washington, USA: US Census Bureau. Online: www.census.gov/foreign-trade/www/sec2.html.

WHO (World Health Organization). 2002. "25 Questions and Answers on Health on and Human Rights." Geneva, Switzerland: WHO.

———. 2005a. "WHO Statistical Information System (WHOSIS): Evidence and Information for Health Policy." Geneva, Switzerland: WHO. Online: www3.who.int/whosis/menu.cfm.

———. 2005b. "World Health Statistics." Geneva, Switzerland; WHO.

WIDER (World Institute for Development Economics Research). 2005. *World Income Inequality Database V 2.0a June 2005.* Helsinki, Finland: WIDER. Online: www.wider.unu.edu/wiid/wiid.htm.

World Bank. 2000. "Toward More Operationally Relevant Indicators of Governance." Prem Notes Public Sector. Washington, USA: World Bank.

———. 2002. "World Bank Group Work in Low-Income Countries under Stress: A Task Force Report." Washington, USA: World Bank.

———. 2004. "World Development Report: Making Services Work for the Poor." Washington, USA: World Bank.

———. 2005a. "World Development Indicators On-line Edition." Washington, USA: World Bank. Online: http://publications.worldbank.org/WDI/.

———. 2005b. "Governance Indicators: 1996-2004." Washington, USA: World Bank. Online: www.worldbank.org/wbi/governance/govdata/.